



**PIOUS POLICY:
THE INFLUENCE OF
THE U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH ON
U.S. FOREIGN AND NATIONAL
SECURITY POLICY
DREW DAVIS**

Drew Davis is the *Executive Director* of the Pax Americana Institute. He holds an AB in Politics & Government, World Religious Studies and National Security and an MA in International Affairs and National Security. Director Davis is a devout Roman Catholic with a sound understanding of the Church and Catechism.

This page intentionally left blank.

Abstract

PIOUS POLICY: THE INFLUENCE OF THE U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH ON U.S. FOREIGN AND NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY.

The intersection of religion and politics has fascinated people for centuries. In modern day, it seems to be an ever-constant concern of many. The enormity of such an issue, however, means that unless a focused and particular approach is implemented when examining it, only the surface of the topic will be scratched. Therefore, in order to fully understand the relationship of these two realms of life, the intersection of the two must be parcelled into manageable pieces and studied thoroughly. Eventually, and only, through such a process, will the most accurate understanding of the topic, and realisation of its complexity, become a reality. This article offers a parcel of the U.S. Catholic Church's influences and impacts on U.S. foreign and national security policy. It is a stepping-stone for moving toward a deeper understanding of such a glorious relationship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
<hr/>	
PART I FROM YESTERDAY UNTIL NOW	
<hr/>	
1. Historical Overview of U.S. Foreign Policy, National Security Policy And Religion’s Role.....	4
USFP History: An Apt Abridgement	5
NSP in US History:	7
The Formative Period.....	7
The Post WWII/Cold War Era	8
The Contemporary Period.....	9
Key Players in FP & NS Policymaking	10
USFP Typologies	11
Catholics & Wilsonianism.....	13
Wilsonianism, Catholicism & The Mission Tradition.....	14
The Marginalisation of Religion in International Relations	16
<hr/>	
PART II TRANSITION FROM WITHIN	
<hr/>	
2. A Transition From Within	20
Anti-Catholic Sentiment in the 19th & 20th Centuries	21
American Catholic Nationalism	24
US Catholic Church & WWI.....	24
US Catholic Church & WWII.....	25
US Catholic Church & Vatican II	27
US Catholic Church & Vietnam.....	28
National Conference of Catholic Bishops	30
United States Catholic Conference	30
The Cold War, Reagan & The “Catholic Team”	31
The Opportunity for Wilsonianism During The Reagan Era	32
The “Holy Alliance” & The “Catholic Team”	34
<hr/>	
PART III MOTIVATIONS FOR INVOLVEMENT	
<hr/>	
3. The Doctrinal & The Practical	37
Ulterior Motives for Involvement?	40

PART IV THE US CATHOLIC CHURCH ON MODERN US FOREIGN
& NATIONAL SECURITY POLICIES

4. A Contemporary Application	44
Strategies: Goals in, Mission For, and Approaches to Modern USFP & NS	44
Specific Issue Focuses & Positions: Defining the Moral High Ground	47
The Just War Doctrine.....	48
Nuclear Weapons	51
Deterrence, Arms Race, and Disarmament	52
The Middle East Peace Process.....	53
Foreign Aide and Debt Relief.....	54
Human Rights	56
Religious Freedoms.....	57
War in Iraq.....	59
Tactics of US Catholic Church in Modern FP & NS	60
Letters & Statements to Political Officials	62
Direct Influences on USFP & NSP	65
Future Influences on USFP & NSP	69

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An extension of deepest appreciation for the assistance, guidance, and support from Drs. Brian Smith, Lamont Colucci, Martin Farrell, and Jody Roy. Your advice and critiques have proven most helpful and inspiring. A blessing to Father Michael Perry, OFM, Franciscans International, for an in-depth, behind the scenes look at the Modern Catholic Church in U.S. Politics.

The following were consulted in the development of this article.

Fr. Frank Michael Perry—OFM, Franciscans International.

Stephen Colecchi—Arms/War/Ethics: USCCB.

Walter Grazer—Human Rights: USCCB.

Dr. Frank Flinn—Washington University, St. Louis: Religious Studies.

U.S. Representative Tammy Baldwin—WI 2nd Dist.: USCB Influence on Congress.

U.S. Representative Tom Petri—WI 6th Dist.: USCCB Influence on Congress.

Father Bryan Hehir—Co-Author of the 1983 USCCB Letter on War & Peace.

Dr. Smidt—Author of *In God We Trust: Religion in American Political Life*.

Dr. Bruce Russett—Yale: Dean Acheson Professor of International Relations and Political Science

GLOSSARY

American Catholic Nationalism. Political attributes include strong nationalistic statements and patriotic foreign initiatives, virulent anticommunism, and a social policy that fostered unionisation. Led by Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York. Religious characteristics include an autocratic Irish and Irish American Episcopal leadership increasingly trained in Rome, a vigorous attack on national churches, a morally based anti-intellectual piety, and a strong emphasis on parochial schools to transmit that piety.

Contemporary Period. Of National Security in US history. 1990s—Today. Noted for: The strengthening, reformation, and expansion of the perpetual safeguards, contingency plans, and national systems of defence created during the Post WWII/Cold War Period.

Foreign Policy. An action and/or declared policy toward other countries, organisations, or non-state actors that seeks to advance and enhance both U.S. vital and national interests.

Formative Period. Period of National Security in US history. 1776—WWII. Noted for: An anti-professional military bias; Efficacy of the Citizen soldier; Preference for rapid mobilisation and demobilisation of the military; Origination of the myth of US invincibility; Preference for total war.

Francis Cardinal Spellman. Archbishop of New York (1939-1967). “The American Pope.” Led: the American Catholic Nationalist movement (early to mid 20th century), the Catholic support for WWII, and served as the Vicar of the US Armed Forces. Uniter of Catholicism and Americanism. Zealously and patriotically militaristic.

Gibbon, Cardinal James. Baltimore. Led American Catholic Bishops in promoting WWI.

Hamiltonianism. Typology of US foreign policy focusing on economic development and strength. Core tenets include: Economic strength, diversity, and prosperity; Expanding trade agreements; Capitalism; and Globalisation.

Jacksonianism. Typology of US foreign policy that focuses on neutralizing a rising threat. Core tenets include: Realism; Dispatching of any up coming threat—economic, military, or political; Very militaristic; Almost always unilateral.

Jeffersonianism. Typology of US foreign policy focusing on the individual over the state. Core tenets include: Small business over corporate business; Protection of individual rights over state’s rights; The dejection of a foreign policy that compromises democratic integrity. **Missionary**

Movement. Initiatives of philanthropic internationalism that included: religious work, medical work, relief work, and political activism of various kinds throughout the world. Early point of entry for Catholics into the realm of US foreign policy. Helped sensitise Americans to the travesties suffered in and faced by the developing countries of Central, South, and Latin America.

Modernisation Theory. Perceives militant and activist religions—globally and domestically—as nothing more than a short-term problem and an annoyance to national security. Caused the avoidance of taking cultural and religious pluralism seriously. Embraced the prevailing school of thought that assumed religion would be a declining factor in the life of states and in international affairs.

National Security Policy. The action and/or declared policy that ensures the perpetuity or continued existence and safety of the nation and the nation’s vital and national interests.

NCCB. National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) was birthed out of Vatican II in the mid-1960s and the splitting of the NCWC. It remains a prominent mouthpiece for the US Catholic Church and is a key player in the Church’s involvement with politics.

NCWC. National Catholic War Council formed in 1917. Dissolved by Pope Pius XI in 1922 before being reinstalled four months later as the National Catholic Welfare Council. Following Vatican II, it split into the NCCB and USCC.

Political Realism. Focuses solely on states’ interests, motives, and power not culture or religions. Geopolitical emphasis. Military might is the dominant form of power in this philosophy of international relations. National security is the main issue of this foreign policy.

Post WWII/Cold War Period. Of National Security in US history. WWII—Early ‘90s. Noted for: 1947 National Security Act (realignment of and addition to US Armed Forces and creation of CIA and Secretary of Defense); Era when national security was not just a concern during wartime; Safeguards, contingency plans, and national systems of defence were employed and announced and national security went from the backburner to a rolling boil almost overnight.

Roosevelt, Franklin D. 32nd President of the US (1933-1945). An Episcopal who remained friendly to the papacy and U.S. Catholic Church.

USCC. United States Catholic Conference (USCC). Birthed out of Vatican II in the mid-1960s and the splitting of the NCWC, it remains a prominent mouthpiece for the US Catholic Church and key player in the Church’s involvement with politics.

USCCB. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Vatican II. A meeting of the world's bishops called by Pope John XXIII in 1962. Known as the Ecumenical Council, it revolutionised church liturgy and ritual. Vatican II called on Catholics to apply their Christian values to the problems of the world through committed involvement with the Church and in the realm of politics.

Westphalian Tradition. Realisation that religious and cultural pluralism could not be easily accommodated in a multi-cultural international society. Recognised the state as the dominant actor, replacing the trans-national authority of the Catholic Church. Birthed the era of *raison d'état* (reason of the state) with strong undertones of non-intervention and state sovereignty.

Wilson, Woodrow. 28th President of the US (1913-1921). A Presbyterian who was unfriendly to Catholic interests and involvement in US politics.

Wilsonianism. Typology of US foreign policy oft associated with idealism. Core tenets include: The embracement and promotion of democracy as the only legitimate form of government in today's world; Advancement of human rights, civil liberties, and capitalism (free market); Global Alliances; Multi-Lateralism; Diplomacy over military employment; Negotiation over Force.

Introduction

“WHAT’S GOING ON HERE?!”

The realms of foreign and national security policymaking are no longer solely monopolised by bureaucratic politicians, congressional committees, and advanced academes. These dominions, over the course of recent decades, have undergone a transformation of not only *who* is participating in the process but also by redefining the *purpose* and *goals* of such policymaking. This transformation can be attributed to the increased involvement of the entire religious community, especially U.S. Evangelicals and the U.S. Catholic Church. While both U.S. Evangelicals and Catholics have distinct priorities for and approaches to foreign and national security policy, this article will explore only that of U.S. Roman Catholics’.

Many more times than not, pragmatism and practicality have carried the day over the incorporation of ethics and morality in devising foreign and national security policy. This left religion, institutionally and doctrinally, on the sidelines in the policy making process. However, as Walter Russel Mead suggests in his recent examination of the topic, secularists and liberals may now be alarmed at the growing influence various religious groups are having on U.S. foreign policy—but, perhaps, “measured optimism would be a better response than panic.”¹ With this ever-increasing involvement, the American people and policy agendas have begun to take a new route—one bound by the virtues of ethics and derived of a moral conscience. This new approach has already had

¹ Mead, Walter R. "God's Country." *Foreign Affairs* 85.5 (Sept/Oct 2006): 24-43.

dramatic effects on foreign policy. In attempts of better understanding this growing phenomenon within U.S. foreign policy, a series of questions must both be asked and answered. How, historically, has the U.S. Catholic Church engaged and interacted with foreign and national security policies? Based on the doctrine and dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, it is pertinent to enquire about what is motivating this religious group and decipher if Catholics have a specific area of interest or focus in foreign policy and/or national security. Once such topics are broached, an exploration of the subsequent enquiries can then occur: What are the strategies, tactics, and resources the Church utilises in advancing their interests in these realms? In the end, with any luck, it will be determinable exactly how much influence Catholics have on dictating American foreign and national security policy agendas and on which policy issues they carry the most weight.

From the onset, such enquiries might seem illogical, as there has long been the perception of a clear and acceptable demarcation of church and state; however, perhaps in examining this issue through the lens of the aforementioned questions we will be able to shine a little more light on exactly how tall, strong, and separating that wall actually is—or at least how real we really want it to be.

For others, such enquiries might seem a bit irrational due to the fact religion has been around for millennia, and it would only seem natural that it would have had *some* effect on politics—specifically the policy-making process. For such a concern, and to better explicate the perspective this article will be taking, it would need to be noted that religion *has* existed within the political system throughout our nation’s history—this is overly apparent in the rhetoric and writings of both the Founding Fathers and early

presidents—and it has interacted in a variety of ways. What makes the “now” era interesting, and very crucial, is the currently enormous global role the U.S. has in foreign and national security policy today and the elaborate processes it embraces in carrying out both the creation and implementation of these policies. Thus, it is not only the simultaneous existence of both concepts—a post-WWII, advanced foreign policy process and increasing religious involvement—that has sparked this examination, but it is the direct engagement of one with the other as they both exist today. As the two are poured together and shaken—not stirred—it will be interesting to see if a homogenous solution will be born or if the two, given political realism and public allowance, will separate and be forced to exist independent of each other.

PART I
FROM YESTERDAY UNTIL NOW

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW
Of U.S. Foreign Policy, National Security Policy & Religion's Role

Before one can truly understand and appreciate the new variables emerging within the realms of foreign policy, a brief overview of the historical progression of foreign and national security policy is not only warranted but necessary. To fully comprehend the changes that have taken place, it is essential to explore what the past approaches, norms, and processes have been to comprehend from where these changes came. Everything must always be understood in context, and it is crucial that we use American history as a lens to better sharpen our perception about the present and future of American foreign and national security policy.

Given the enormity of exploring such a topic as the history of U.S. foreign and national security policy (USFP and NSP, respectively), it is appropriate to focus on the parts of each that accentuate our topic—religion's role (particularly Catholics') in USFP and NSP—by giving us the best look at how the policy process works, how it has evolved, and both who have been and are currently involved in today's process.

A definition is not only a suitable launching point for context but, perhaps, a necessary one. Foreign policy is an action and/or declared policy toward other countries, organisations, or non-state actors that seeks to advance and enhance both U.S. vital and national interests.² Comparatively, national security policy is the action and/or declared

² Colucci, Dr. Lamont. Foreign Service Officer Emeritus. Seoul, South Korea Desk, Seoul Embassy. Lecture on U.S. Foreign Policy at Ripon College, Ripon, Wis. 2005-01-18

policy that ensures the perpetuity or continued existence and safety of the nation and the nation's vital and national interests.³

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY HISTORY- AN APT ABRIDGEMENT

U.S. foreign policy, in its short history of about four hundred years, has exhibited both periods and patterns of introversion and extroversion, embracing either isolationism or internationalism. While the concept of isolationism is grossly over proclaimed and could easily be considered a myth, the U.S. has unarguably at least exhibited times of chosen withdrawal and decided to take a more hands-off approach to its foreign policy. These patterns of intro- and extroversion are divisible into five periods of U.S. history⁴:

	<u>Introversion</u>	<u>Extroversion</u>
1)	1776-1798	1798-1824
2)	1824-1844	1844-1871
3)	1871-1891	1891-1918
4)	1918-1940	1940-1967
5)	1967-1987	1987-2014

The oscillation between isolationism and internationalism has not been haphazard.⁴ According to renowned British historian Frank Klingberg, each twenty to thirty year period in U.S. history is driven by an underlying logic that appears to have guided the movement from one period to the next, and this guiding force was not from the involvement, influence, or impact of a religious groups. In period one, Klingberg asserts, it was the struggle for independence; in period two, issues catalysed from manifest destiny; in period three, it was the industrial revolution and the process of becoming a

³ Colucci, Lamont. Lecture on U.S. National Security Policy. Ripon College, Ripon, WI. 2006-08-23.

⁴ Hastedt, Glenn P. American Foreign Policy: Pastf Present, Future. Sixth Ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2006. p.37

global industrial power; in period four, it was the crisis of world democracy; and today's era is dominated by the need to create a stable world order, safe and productive for all peoples.⁵

Beyond the guiding force of U.S. foreign policy intro- or extroversion, there exists disagreement among political scientists and historians over the exact mechanisms that caused such shifts in each time. Klingberg purports a number of possibilities: the failure of long-term policy, the arrival of a new generation of policy-makers, the onset of a critical problem requiring a solution not in line with the country's mood, or the corruption and distortion of an ongoing line of action.⁵ Others do not agree with Klingberg. Dexter Perkins, a prominent American anthropologist, suggests the shifts in foreign policy orientation are related to the trends of the business cycle and the economy⁶ while Robert Dallek, another prominent American historian, sees the episodic shifts as the products of domestic frustrations and disappointments with current courses of action.⁷ Regardless, however, of which of the above mechanisms one chooses to credit, it must be recognised that, of all the purported influences, none came from third-party religious groups, organisations, or entities—Catholic or otherwise.

The history of U.S. National Security is not so categorical. Surrounded by oceans and quickly rising to power in its hemisphere, the United States' concept of national security was only a concern during wartime from the 1770s through World War II. Some have argued that it was virtually non-existent until the turn of the twentieth century. It

⁵ Klingberg, Frank. Positive Expectation's of America's World Role. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996.

⁶ Perkins, Dexter. The American Approach to Foreign Policy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962. p.154

⁷ Dallek, Robert. The American Style of Foreign Policy, Cultural Politics and Foreign Affairs. New York: New American Library, 1983.

was not until after World War II—and the beginning of the Cold War era—that the U.S. began to maintain significantly-sized standing armies during peacetime, began to implement constant protective measures to guard against and prevent imminent threats of destruction, established a permanent national security bureaucracy, and set-up a permanent intelligence service. From independence to date, the evolution of U.S. NSP (national security policy) can be viewed in three phases: The Formative Period (1776-WWII); The Cold War Era (Post WWII to about the Fall of the Berlin Wall in 1991); and The Contemporary Period (the '90s through today).

NATIONAL SECURITY IN U.S. HISTORY

THE FORMATIVE PERIOD OF NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY (NSP)

The Formative Period yielded five military traditions, some of which are important today and some of which no longer exist: An anti professional-military bias; Efficacy of the Citizen soldier; Preference for rapid mobilisation and demobilisation of the military; A myth of invincibility; and Preference for total war. After the American Revolution and the ill-will from the mandate to quarter soldiers, the citizenry was very distrustful of military personnel and officers. This catalysed an anti professional-military mentality and the development of temporary, non-national militias (citizen soldiers) that would only mobilise and arm when absolutely necessary and quickly demobilise and disarm immediately afterwards. With such distrust, the American people were in no mood to embrace standing armies in any form—for the sake of national security or not. Having defeated the British, however—the most capable and competent power in the world—the Americans themselves began to feel quite capable and invulnerable as a people, and, thus, the myth of invincibility was born. The United States' quick rise to

dominance on the continent and a feeling of protected isolationism provided by the world's two largest oceans only fuelled this myth—until Pearl Harbor.

Of these five traditions that emerged and began to shape the next 150 years,⁸ not one can be grounded in or connected to the influences of any particular religion or religious group. This is not to say that the decisions of the key players in national security at the time (executive politicians) were not guided by personal religious beliefs, as the opposite is perhaps evident by the legislation compiled in the *American State Papers*,⁸ but rather it is to say that the institutions of religion themselves were not yet major players in the NSP process itself. Why religion was oft marginalised in this process will be explored in a subsequent portion of this section.

POST WWII/COLD WAR ERA OF NSP

The post-WWII/Cold War era of NSP, with the U.S. having now been catapulted to a global position of power and political prominence, brought about a serious recognition of the importance of national security. This recognition happened for the first time in U.S. history in 1947, with the passage of the National Security Act under President Truman. The realignment of U.S. armed forces and the establishment of a national intelligence agency (CIA) were only a few notable implementations of, what was then, the nation's nascent national security policy. With the ever-imminent threat of nuclear destruction from the Soviet Union—an issue which the U.S. Catholic Church has whole-heartedly embraced—the United States' myth of invincibility and ill-will toward a standing army *mysteriously* vanished. Safeguards, contingency plans, and national

⁸ See: *American State Papers*, containing the legislative and executive documents of Congress during the period 1789 to 1838, notably Vol. I *Foreign Relations*.

systems of defence were employed and announced—in that order for a reason—and national security went from the backburner to a rolling boil almost overnight. One might believe that this sudden and overwhelming focus on a militarily-heavy NSP and an extroverted FP would have initiated an immediate concern or denunciation from supposed “peace loving religious groups” like the Catholic Church. The “peace-loving” concept of U.S. Catholics in the early to mid twentieth century, however, is best articulated through a series of surveys outlined in Part II: *Transition From Within: American Catholic Nationalism: The U.S. Church & Vietnam*, p.28.

THE CONTEMPORARY PERIOD OF NSP

The Contemporary Period, dominated by 9/11, has only seen the strengthening and reformation of the perpetual safeguards, contingency plans, and national systems of defence created during the previous period. As the world grows smaller through the progressive evolution of globalisation and economic markets, and the U.S. is forced again and again into the position of *The Sheriff*,⁹ its oscillation between a realist, unilateral approach to NSP and a collaborative, multilateral approach will be unending. However, regardless of the camp the U.S. finds itself in, there have been definable patterns—typologies—within U.S. NSP that have resurfaced time and time again. To better understand America’s history of FP and NSP, and where religion’s role may arise, an examination of these typologies would be beneficial. However, before such an examination can occur, it is first necessary to know the key players in developing foreign and national security policy so as to understand whom the typologies are encapsulating.

⁹ Gray, Colin S. *The Sheriff: America’s Defense of the New World Order*. Lexington, University Press of Kentucky, 2004.

KEY PLAYERS IN U.S.F.P. & U.S.N.S. POLICYMAKING

The extensive network of politicians, institutes, and agencies that comprise the bureaucracy of foreign and national security policymaking has many overlapping key players. In the chart below the shared players are bolded. While the foreign policy process is, in general, made up of more players, simply given the vast resources and cultural knowledge that is necessary in dictating appropriate and successful policy, it is worth noting those who are *not* included in the lists of both groups.

Foreign Policy Process Key Players

1. **The President**
2. **The Secretary of State**
3. **The Department of State (DoS)**
4. **Department of Central Intelligence (DCI)**
5. **Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)**
6. **Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS)**
7. **Secretary of Defence**
8. **Department of Defence (DoD)**
9. Foreign Relations Committee (House & Senate)
10. Intelligence and Defence Committees
11. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
12. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

National Security Process Key Players

1. **The President**
2. **The Secretary of State**
3. **The Department of State**
4. **DCI** (Dept. of Central Intel.)
5. **CIA** (Central Intel. Agency)
6. **Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS)**
7. **Secretary of Defence**
8. **Department of Defence (DoD)**
9. NSC (National Security Council)
10. White House Office
11. OMB (Office of Mgt.. & Budget)

Within this list is *not* one group, organisation, or committee whose sole purpose is the examination and application of ethics, morality, or just conduct in international law. This may be due to the perceived limitation of the wall of separation between church and state, as presented at the onset of this article, or it may be due to the fact those players listed are assumed to already possess the faculties and motivation needed to design such policies around those principles. Turning on the news to find yet another politician convicted of conduct unbecoming of their office, this author is hard pressed to agree with either option and has simply noted the lack of such a presence in either of the policy-making processes.

Seeing who is intimately involved with the design and implementation of foreign and national security policy allows for the patterns that have occurred in the histories of each—and that are categorised in the following four typologies—to be better understood and applied.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TYPOLOGIES

In the immediate wake of September 11, 2001, Walter Russell Mead—author, historian, and a senior fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations—found it an apt time to examine U.S. foreign and national security policy. Mead did so in hopes of gaining a more sound understanding of policy history to better determine how and why the U.S. had found herself in the position it was in and what would be the most appropriate way to respond, in policy. Throughout his examination, Mead was able to categorise the various eras of U.S. foreign policy into four typologies—Wilsonian, Hamiltonian, Jeffersonian, and Jacksonian. It is important to realise that each typology reflected, and continues to reflect, both the way the U.S. engaged and behaved in the international community and the mentality, mission, and expectations of the citizens and policy-makers within the U.S. at that time as well, for the latter is directly responsible for the course of the former. For the sake of historical perspective, it is central to understand what each of these typologies embodies ideologically so that it can be understood what each offers politically and how and why religion may choose to engage.

Wilsonianism can best be understood as *idealism*. Purporting that democracy is not only the best form of governance but the only applicable and acceptable one in today's world, *Wilsonianism* advances the cause of human rights, civil liberties, freedoms, and

capitalism—the free market. It embraces global alliances and multi-lateralism, diplomacy over military employment, and negotiation over force. It works through such means to advance and protect not only U.S. citizens and interests but the integrity of citizens everywhere. A second typology, *Hamiltonianism*, is founded on the principles of economic strength, diversity, and prosperity, and focuses its energy on expanding trade agreements, capitalism, and globalisation. Through these tenets will the U.S., given its innovative ability, natural resources, and capital, be able to protect its superpower status and advance its own interests in a competitive global market. *Jeffersonianism*, a third typology, building off of Thomas Jefferson’s personal beliefs, favours small business over corporate business, the protection of individual rights over state’s rights, and dejects a foreign policy that compromises democratic integrity. *Jacksonianism*, the final typology, can best be understood as the antithesis of Wilsonianism. It is birthed in the comfortless cradle of realism. A policy that completely—and ruthlessly if necessary—dispatches of any up-and-coming threat on the horizon, whether that threat be a peer competitor, economic challenger, or obstacle to the achievement of another interest, Jacksonianism is by far the most militaristic of the previous three, and unilateral if necessary at that.¹⁰

With the notable exception of the Bush Doctrine (G.W. Bush), which today seems to fit neither comfortably nor correctly into any of the four aforementioned typologies, political and foreign policy historians have been able to categorise the various approaches to U.S. foreign policy (USFP) and national security (NS) through these four lenses. As pointed out in the introduction, an increasing Catholic involvement within an

¹⁰ Mead, Walter R. Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Books, Inc., 2002.

ever-more complicated realm of foreign policy is quickly becoming a reality, leaving one to enquire: Which, of the four typologies, does the Catholic Church embrace, and why? Having just a slice of each typology's beliefs, it would not take long to realise U.S. Catholics have long hailed the virtues of Wilsonianism. As will later be discussed, the advancement and protection of human rights is a core policy focus for Catholics, along with the protection of religious freedoms—a product of defined civil liberties and freedoms, and the Wilsonian typology makes human rights and liberties central focuses of its efforts.

CATHOLICS AND WILSONIANISM

Of the four typologies—not including the Eisenhower roll-backers or the Bush Doctrine, Wilsonianism is the only one both grounded in natural law and expressive of a grounding in serious religious belief. When one considers the Wilsonians' professed faith in human nature, the strong commitment to human rights, and the persistent dream of a world of nation-states united by their devotion to the ideas of liberty and their detestation of war it is hard to imagine the Catholics would fall anyplace else.¹¹ Hamiltonianism has taken a predominantly secular approach to foreign policy through economically-driven diplomacy that, while optimistic and peaceful like Wilsonianism, still misses the mark with its intention—peace through market development because everyone can benefit financially and, thus, enhance living conditions. Wilsonianism advances various interests because “it is the right thing to do” based on both natural law and the will of the Divine. Jeffersonianism, like Jefferson himself, is based on the principles of practicality and

¹¹ Mead. Special Providence. p. 100

simplicity, even at the price of inequality. Even after acknowledging that Jeffersonianism embraces the integrity of democracy given its roots in both natural law and Divine inspiration, in the end, when its focuses and goals are considered and scrutinised, Jeffersonian principles are simply not quite as compatible as Wilsonianism's. It is a close second in some places, but a second nonetheless. With a great potential for less than civil tactics in Jacksonianism, it is not necessary to explain why Catholicism is not grounded in its principles. Though, by the end of Part II, one may begin to wonder how true this is.

It is clear Wilsonianism is a perfect fit, and within the foreign policy histories of Wilsonianism lies another story that only further amplifies this matching and describes the earliest of impacts Catholics had on USFP; it is that of the Missionary Tradition.

WILSONIANISM, CATHOLICISM, and THE MISSION TRADITION

With the Wilsonian view that both an American and global society must be based on the principles of democratic government and the protection of human rights comes the question: how does one work to attain such ideals? The answer first became apparent in overseas missionary activity. This mission movement was an early point of entry for Catholics into direct contact and experience in foreign affairs and policy.¹²

The story of American missionary activity—encompassing the efforts and energies of countless Americans in religious work, medical work, relief work, and political activism of various kinds throughout the world—Mead asserts in his analysis of USFP and how it changed the world, is part of the “lost history”¹³ of American foreign policy. It has played “a much larger role in the relationship of the United States to the world, in

¹² Mead. Special Providence. p.152

¹³ Mead. Special Providence. p.139

that of the world to the United States, and in the growing sense of a world community than is generally recognised.”¹⁴ Yet the missionary movement, one of the most impacting and longest sustained efforts ever made by huge numbers of Americans in any field, with vast consequences for this century, is in intellectual eclipse.¹⁴

The missionary movement and other allied movements of philanthropic internationalism beginning in the nineteenth century have indeed set the stage for the way Catholics would engage with foreign and national security policy in the upcoming decades. As a result of these early and sustained missions and missionary orders, Americans have been sensitised and educated about the values and concerns of myriad countries all throughout Central and Latin America and have thus supported foreign policies and initiatives to work with, develop, and defend these regions of the hemisphere. A subtle, religiously motivated action, with time and perseverance, has thus resulted in a significant portion of U.S. foreign and national security policy and set the direction for such policies for decades to come.

Outside of the efforts of notable religiously-motivated Presidents such as Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower,¹⁵ and the reoccurring periods in which Presidents and other policymakers have embraced Wilsonianism, is left a rather secular history of foreign and national security policy whose focuses and goals have not been the incorporation of ethics and morality but rather the guarantee of

¹⁴ Mead. Special Providence. p.140

¹⁵ It should be noted that while there were many other personally-religious Presidents whose beliefs certainly influenced their decision making, the above are directly pertinent and applicable to this article given they fall within the time table of when the United States began to develop advanced foreign policies and seriously embrace the virtue of national security.

success and dominance. Seeing, then, that three other typologies remain to summarise USFP history, all of which do not integrate religious philosophy to the extent Wilsonianism does, if at all, it then follows that religion, as an institution, did not historically wield the influence on the policy-making process that it later did with Wilsonian-based presidents. This naturally prompts the next, and final, question in this *brief* historical overview: Why has religion itself been marginalised in international relations—is it the people or is it the process?

THE MARGINALISATION OF RELIGION IN INT'L RELATIONS

Scott M. Thomas, author of *The Global Resurgence of Religion and The Transformation of International Relations: The Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-First Century*, has, conveniently, already explored such an issue, and presented three reasons why religion has been marginalised in international relations. For the sake of our investigation—to better understand the historical context—it is pertinent to examine such reasons. First, religion has long been undermined by the adoption of the *Modernisation Theory*. Secondly, when the concept of international relations was “born-again” in “modern history,” it took off into the harsh crosswinds of the *Westphalian Presumption*. Thirdly, Thomas articulated how most states, after buying into the concept of and adopting an approach to international relations, quickly began to espouse a philosophy that Machiavelli himself would have hailed, had he not been, and ironically so, driven into a fatal illness by the *self-interested* actions of the Spanish when they invaded Italy and ousted the Medici family for a second time. This third obstacle of marginalisation was a philosophy of *Political Realism*.

More contemporarily, the *Modernisation theory* has allowed Western policy-makers—particularly since the mid-twentieth century—to perceive militant and activist religions—globally and domestically—as nothing more than a short-term problem and an annoyance to national security, and, thus, the modernisation theory has caused the avoidance of taking cultural and religious pluralism seriously.¹⁶ Contributing to this for decades was the prevailing school of thought underlying USFP that assumed religion would be a declining factor in the life of states and in international affairs;¹⁷ however, experience has shown—and is continuing to show through the mouthpieces of many U.S. Evangelicals and Catholics—that the exact opposite is increasingly true, especially in the U.S., which has been hailed by many as the most religious country on earth.

Focusing more historically is the *Westphalian Presumption*. Following the Treaty of Westphalia and the conclusion of the 'Thirty Years' War in 1648, states became noticeably more involved in the international arena, and began to embrace the concept of international relations more and more—realising the advantages that came in doing so. With such occurring, the realisation that religious and cultural pluralism could not be easily accommodated in a genuinely global and multi-cultural international society became the understanding. Perhaps it was birthed from the reluctance to even attempt such an accommodation. Nonetheless, the *Westphalian Presumption* recognised the *state* as the dominant actor, replacing the trans-national authority of the Catholic Church and eliciting Pope Innocent X to famously declare the treaty null, void, invalid, iniquitous, unjust,

¹⁶ Thomas, Scott M. The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations: the Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-First Century. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Ch 2-p. 54.

¹⁷ Johnston, Douglas, and Cynthia Sampson. Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft. Center for Strategic and International Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. p.33

damnable, reprobate, inane, and devoid of meaning for all time!¹⁸ Ergo, the secular principle of *raison d'état* (reason of the state) was born and religion was often marginalised from that point forward. If and when sporadic religious fervour called for international engagement on the basis of moral or ethical reasons, the key aspect of the *Westphalian Presumption*—non-intervention—shunted its influence and, many times, its happening.

Political Realism, an ever-reoccurring and often dominant international relations approach, stemming out of both of the aforementioned concepts, focuses solely on states: their interests, their motives, and their power—geopolitics—not their culture, and certainly not their religions. Military might is the dominant form of power in this philosophy of international relations, and national security is the main issue confronting a state's foreign policy.

From these three primary factors—many of the secondary left unmentioned—has come the marginalisation of religion in foreign policy and the explanation as to why it did not wield the influence on the policy-making process that it has begun to. Reflecting on the enquiry posed at the onset of this section: Why has religion been marginalised in international relations—is it the people or is it the process?, we see that, as is often the case with analysing foreign policy, it is very difficult to separate the people from the process when attempting to assign blame, as one is a product of the other—it is even unclear as to which is the product of which!

¹⁸ Johnston, Douglas, and Cynthia Sampson. *Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. Center for Strategic and International Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. Ch. 2, p.55. A further exploration of Pope Innocent X's motives for such a decree is articulated in the latter portion of this article involving papal authority. See *Part III: Ulterior Motives*.

Through Mead's typologies and Thomas' marginalisations, it is clear that religion has been forced to stand on the sidelines of American foreign and national security policy for most of its history. However, "the crowd"—the citizenry, notably the Catholic citizenry—since the beginning of the twentieth century, has been calling for religion to be put into the game. How and why did this transition occur, and has "the coach" been listening?

PART II TRANSITION FROM WITHIN

The Metamorphosis of U.S. Foreign and National Security Policy Due to Historical Circumstance
Not Religious Happenstance.

In the introduction a series of questions regarding U.S. Catholic involvement in FP and NSP were presented. Now that an appropriate historical foundation of USFP and NSP has been outlined, and religion's role thus far put into context, this section will focus on the first of those enquiries: How, historically, has the U.S. Catholic Church engaged and interacted with foreign and national security policies. While one such way—the missionary movement of the Wilsonian typology—has already been presented, there is a further evolution needing illustration.

Lord Bryce, a British statesman who served as Britain's ambassador to the United States from 1907 to 1913, once wrote that the role of foreign policy in American life could be described the way travellers described the snakes in Ireland:¹⁹ “There are no snakes in Ireland.”²⁰ While his motives for declaring such may, indeed, be questionable, his point was certainly legitimate. At the turn of the twentieth century, American foreign policy was still in its pre-natal stages and national security policy was virtually nonexistent. Causes of this, as previously noted, span from circumstantial—the right circumstances had not yet been present—to the country's apathetic will—the American people were not motivated to engage at the international level—to, finally, geographical—the U.S. was safely isolated by the world's two largest oceans and reaping the benefits of a resource-

¹⁹ Mead, Walter R. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. New York: Taylor & Francis Books, Inc., 2002. p.3

²⁰ Bryce, James. *The American Commonwealth*. New York: Macmillan Company, Vol II, 1927. p.565.

rich land. Regardless of the cause, however, throughout most of the nineteenth century, until the peak of the U.S. industrial revolution, the U.S. still found herself living in a world that was ruled by the Pax Britannica, and it was not taking steps to change this reality—namely through over-hauling its foreign policy and national security approaches. Such an over-haul in both foreign and national security policy, as previously described, did not come until the end of the Second World War, with national security policies such as *NSC-68*, a blueprint policy setting the course for dealing with Soviet Russia during the Cold War, when the United States was catapulted into the position of being one of two dominant global powers. It was at this time the definition of USFP and NSP as we know it today was born.

ANTI-CATHOLIC SENTIMENT IN THE U.S. 19TH & 20TH CENTURIES

While the evolution of American involvement at the international level unfolded throughout the early and mid-twentieth century, so, too, did that of the U.S. Catholic Church. To understand why the U.S. Catholic Church did not involve itself earlier in USFP and NS it must be understood that the Catholic Churches of not only The United States but also the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa have only recently become full participants in their respective societies, for during much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Catholics in these countries suffered political and social discrimination.²¹ These respective cultures had been formed in the tradition and image of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism, and America, especially, had

²¹ Hanson, Eric O. *The Catholic Church in World Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987. p.165

embraced a long tradition of Anti-Catholic bigotry.²² The strength of Catholicism in the U.S. only began when the centuries-long British persecution, coupled with the Great Potato Famine, finally resulted in waves of Irish emigration to the U.S. in the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This emigration played a principle role in forming the Catholic Churches of the former British colonies noted above, especially the United States. Even though Catholics emigrated from different countries, the Irish inflow was early and constant, and they already spoke fluent English, leaving them in a natural position to influence.

Already alien in a Protestant nation, Catholicism, perhaps fated from the beginning, was only further stifled in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century by the discrimination toward the Irish upon their arrival to the U.S. Regardless of what the Statue of Liberty professed, the Irish—as “poor, tired, and longing to be free...” as they were—were not welcomed with open arms and warm hearts. Any student of American history is familiar with the enormity of the anti-Irish movement in the beginning of the twentieth century. On top of store fronts often displaying signs that read, *No Animals or Irish; No Shoes, No Shirt, No Irish; Irish Need Not Apply, No Service for Irish*, and, bluntly, *Irish Keep Out!*, came the frequent and routine beatings the Irish endured on the streets of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. Finding a job of sustainable pay if you were Irish was no easy measure.

²² For a more in-depth look at anti-Catholic rhetoric in American society, see: Roy, Jody M. *Rhetorical Campaigns of the 19th-c. Anti-Catholics & Catholics in America*. Lewiston NY: Edwin Mellen, 2000.

More historically, as Mead noted in his analysis of USFP—Special Providence,²³ for most of its history Jacksonian America believed that the Roman Catholic Church was the chief emissary of Satan on earth—a belief the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church still embraces. Rooted in the bloody struggles of the British Reformation, the Scotch-Irish border people came to believe that the Bishop of Rome was the conscious head of a vast conspiracy (an assertion that will again be explored in subsequent portions of this article, see: **ULTERIOR MOTIVES FOR INVOLVEMENT IN USFP & NSP?** p.40). For two hundred years plots, and rumours of plots, roiled society’s imagination: Catholics tried to blow up King James I and both Houses of Parliament in the Guy Fawkes plot. Mary Queen of Scots schemed with the French to overthrow Elizabeth I and bring back the Inquisition, with Protestant martyrs burned at the stake. The later Stuarts participated in papist plots against the liberties of Britain. True and false accusations stirred public opinions to a fever pitch, while a steady stream of propaganda reinforced popular fear of the cruelty, the cleverness, and the utter ruthlessness of the Vatican and its vast and far-flung army of conspiratorial allies.

On top of an imaginative history, however, and already at the bottom of the social and economic latter given the nature of immigration, Irish Catholics were also believed to embrace the virtues and traditions of the “Roman” over those of the “American” as well, making it all the more difficult to assimilate into society. Militant native-stock Protestants had long impugned the “Americanism” of Catholics, citing Pope Leo XIII’s hostility to church-state separation as proof that “Romanism” threatened

²³ Mead. Special Providence. Ch. 7: Tiger, Tiger, Burning Bright, The Jacksonian School of USFP (The School of Andrew Jackson) pgs 218-263. History of the fear of Catholicism taken from pg. 149.

American religious liberty.²⁴ To combat such a claim by Protestants, “Catholics began to over-identify with American nationalism”²⁵ by flocking to patriotic monuments, memorials, and veterans’ groups, eager to display extreme vigilance through acts of superpatriotism.²⁵ Blessed by circumstance however—the outbreak of WWI—the Irish’s American Catholic Nationalism that had been attempting to blossom found an opportunity to come to fruition.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC NATIONALISM: The W’s, I’s and the V’s: WWI, WWII, VATICAN II & VIETNAM

The term, “American Catholic Nationalism” combines both political and religious characteristics. Political attributes include strong nationalistic statements and patriotic foreign initiatives, virulent anticommunism, and a social policy that fostered unionisation.²⁶ These attributes received their archetypical expression under Francis Cardinal Spellman, the archbishop of New York, whose role in advancing U.S. Catholic Church engagement with FP and NSP will later be discussed. Religious characteristics include an autocratic Irish and Irish American Episcopal leadership increasingly trained in Rome, a vigorous attack on national churches, a morally based anti-intellectual piety, and a strong emphasis on parochial schools to transmit that piety.²⁶

U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH & WWI

With the outbreak of WWI, a prime time for any group to engage with U.S. foreign policy, American Catholicism with its strong Irish and German traditions had

²⁴ Wald, Kenneth D. Religion and Politics in the United States. Fourth Ed. New York: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003. p.250

²⁵ Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform. New York, NY: Vintage, 1965.

²⁶ Hanson, Eric O. The Catholic Church in World Politics. p.167

plenty of reasons to stay neutral in World War I, or even to support the Central Powers.²⁷ However, U.S. Catholics did not choose to let this opportunity to engage go by. The assembled American Bishops, led by Cardinal James Gibbons of Baltimore, enthusiastically promoted the war, and only four Catholic conscientious objectors surfaced out of a national total of 3,989. A survey done in 1917-1918 could identify no priest or bishop as a pacifist, and over one million Catholics (a ratio significantly in excess of its proportion in the population) served in the armed forces at the time. Cardinal Gibbons rose to honorary chairman for the League of National Unity—an organisation dedicated to prosecuting the war to the finish—and led the American Bishops in presenting papal peace initiatives to President Woodrow Wilson, whom he knew remained unfriendly to Catholic interests.²⁸ (Hanson, 169)

U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH & WWII

Between the World Wars, united by American Catholic Nationalism and patriotism, Catholics began to find increasing pockets of acceptance throughout the nation. Also fuelling this acceptance and rise in momentum were the emerging political attributes of the Church noted above (strong nationalistic statements, patriotic foreign initiatives, virulent anticommunism agendas, and social policies that fostered unionisation). Archbishop Spellman of New York, who, for his candour and leadership, was nicknamed, “The American Pope,” soon began to command the political energy of

²⁷ Hanson, Eric O. The Catholic Church in World Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. p.169

²⁸ Hennessey, James. American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1981. pgs.223-228

the U.S. Church and brought it even further into the foreign policy and national security arena.

After Spellman, a personal associate of Pius XII, returned to the U.S. in 1932 from a seven year tour with the Vatican Secretariat of State, the Office of the President, held now by Franklin Roosevelt, became much more friendly to the papacy and U.S. Church unlike during Wilson's term. As the principal national figure among the U.S. bishops until his death in 1967, Spellman seized this opportunity and harnessed a growing Catholic acceptance to lead American Catholic support for World War II. He led such a campaign of support in both the role of the Archbishop of New York and as military vicar of the American armed forces. Through Spellman, the "fusion of the themes of Catholicism and Americanism" were once and for all completed and put on a pedestal for all Americans to see.

During this time, Spellman forged strong links between the church and leaders of secular conservative movements. Under his influence, the Catholic hierarchy enthusiastically endorsed the active involvement of the United States in military conflicts wherever communism, fascism, or authoritarianism was thought to be a threat. From Spain in the 1930s through Vietnam in the 1960s, Spellman consistently favoured a policy that has been satirised by the phrase, "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition." (Hanson, 249)

The decades following World War II were notably the most important for U.S. Catholics than any other, as the U.S. Catholic Church experienced a dramatic upward shift in both mobility and ability. It was during these years that, as a whole, the entire Catholic community enjoyed substantial increases in economic status, social acceptance,

and the acquisition of politically relevant skills and resources.²⁹ Having “left the ghetto”³⁰ economically and psychologically, Catholics assumed a larger role in both national and foreign policy politics. The direction of this role was principally determined by events in Rome: Vatican II.

US CATHOLIC CHURCH & VATICAN II

What changed the Catholic Church in America—or what gave it the official trends that were developing independently and under Spellman—was a meeting of the world’s bishops called by Pope John XXIII in 1962. This historic meeting, known as Vatican II, or the Ecumenical Council, revolutionised church liturgy and ritual. The most pertinent aspect to this article, from a political standpoint, was that the leaders of the Church called on *all* Catholics to apply their Christian values to the problems of the world and outlined the areas of focus to best do so.³¹ Of course to engage in such actions would involve an intimate relationship and interactivity with foreign and national security policy. (Hanson, 252)

The statement by Vatican II professing this involvement was supplemented in 1983, 1993, and, most recently in 2004 (*Catholics in Political Life*) by other letters written by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. These letters are subsequently explored in Parts III and IV of this article. Also building upon the statements of Vatican II came a host of very influential social encyclicals during and after that helped to articulate the motivations and focuses of Catholics in politics, including: Pope John XXXIII *Pacem in*

²⁹ Hanson, Eric O. *The Catholic Church in World Politics*. pgs 251-252.

³⁰ Hannah, Mary T. *Catholics and American Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979. p.22

³¹ See the specific issue focuses in Part IV for a more complete look at the components of Vatican II.

Terris (“Peace on Earth.” On Establishing Universal Peace in Truth, Justice, Charity and Liberty) and *Mater et Magistra* (“Mother is Master.” On the topic of Christianity and Social Progress); and Pope Paul VI *Humanae Vitae* (“Of Human Life.” On the sanctity of human life and protection thereof). Papal encyclicals such as these, and the statements made on religious freedoms, during and shortly after Vatican II were instrumental in guiding the direction of the U.S. Church in the political realm for the remainder of the century and into the next.

U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH & VIETNAM

Dorothy Dohen, noted Catholic journalist and sociologist of religion, began her book *Nationalism and American Catholicism* with the answer Archbishop Spellman gave to U.S. troops in Vietnam as he visited during Christmas in 1965. When asked about the role of the United States in Vietnam, Spellman replied, “I fully support everything it does...My country, may it always be right. Right or wrong, my country.”³² The pastoral letter of all the American bishops released the following November showed more hesitation than Cardinal Spellman, but nevertheless concluded that on the whole American involvement in Vietnam was justified.³³ Regardless of the caution, critique, and apprehension presented in the November pastoral letter, in foreign affairs, the Church was synonymous with vigorous opposition to communism and other perceived threats to the social order, and the involvement in Vietnam was an opportunity to contain the

³² Dohen, Dorothy. *Nationalism and American Catholicism*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1974. p.1

³³ Benstead, Brian J. and Butler, Francis J., eds., *Quest for Justice: A Compendium of Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops on the Political and Social Order 1966-1980*. Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1982. pp 51-55.

imminent spread of communism. The support for Vietnam would change, however, in the years to come.

While Protestants, too, supported U.S. foreign policy movements against communism and fascism throughout the twentieth century, when compared with the rest of the population, Catholics exhibited much greater readiness to support U.S. military involvement around the globe.³⁴ As originally noted in a survey around WWI, the militaristic tendency was still apparent among young Catholics just before and during the Vietnam War. In 1952, in a number of studies about attitudes toward the use of force in international politics (Klineberg 1950, 175; Eckert and Mills 1935) almost three thousand devout Roman Catholic students on eleven universities scored higher than other religious groups on a scale measuring emphasis on power (rather than cooperation) in world affairs (Peter Blau, 1953). When a similar study was conducted in 1967 by Connors, Leonard, and Burnham (1968), the same pattern was noted. Among one thousand students from four eastern colleges, Catholics exhibited the most warlike attitudes.³⁵ These studies offer a good perspective for “Protestant outsiders” to understand the mentality of Catholics during this era and how it may have affected their involvement with foreign and security policies. This perspective may also have left Protestants thinking Catholicism aligned more closely with *Jacksonianism* rather than *Wilsonianism*!

³⁴ Wald. Religion and Politics in the United States. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Fourth Edition, 2003. p.249.

³⁵ Wald. Religion and Politics in the United States. p.249.

**NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS (NCCB)
&
THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE (USCC)**

In the heart of WWI, as Catholic nationalism and support for the war grew and U.S. Church officials dared their hands in USFP, the U.S. Catholic Church established the National Catholic War Council (NCWC) to coordinate the Church's patriotic efforts. This Council, perhaps the best reflection of the afore-cited Catholic warlike mentality, was a wonderful example of one of the U.S. Church's first outlets and seriously determined efforts for engaging in the realm of foreign and national security policy.

Following Vatican II, the NCWC, which, by then had been renamed the Catholic Welfare Council, split into the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the United States Catholic Conference (USCC). This took one entity for the engagement in security studies and foreign policy and turned it into two outlets—both with a far less militaristic overtone than the NCWC originally connoted.

The political and social policy of the USCC has combined very liberal positions on international affairs and domestic social policy with conservative concerns about family morality and parochial schools. It has publicly backed total unconditional amnesty for Vietnam War resisters; it has decried Reagan's budget cuts, military aid to El Salvador, apartheid, and the abuse of human rights in South Korea, Brazil, and Chile. The bishops' foreign policy for the 1970s and 1980s was prefigured in November 1971 when the NCCB, after years of support and hedging, finally condemned continued American military operations in South East Asia (Hanson, pgs. 178-179):

At this point in history it seems clear to us that whatever good we hope to achieve through continued involvement in this war is now outweighed by the destruction of human life and of moral values which it inflicts. It is our firm conviction, therefore, that the speedy ending of this war is a moral

*imperative of the highest priority. Hence, we feel an obligation to appeal urgently to our nation's leaders and indeed to leaders of all the nations involved in this tragic conflict to bring the war to an end with no further delay.*³⁶

The statement had come so long after other religious bodies and members of the Catholic laity had condemned the war that its tardiness embarrassed the U.S. Catholic bishops. It, nonetheless, marked a revolutionary repudiation of American Catholic nationalism,³⁷ and was, perhaps, the birth of a demarcation of camps in U.S. Catholicism—those who remained highly-focused on the militaristic aspect of U.S. NSP and those who preferred a more diplomatic, mediation-based style.

The USCC and NCCB have continued to be the primary outlets and mouthpieces for political engagement, on both domestic and foreign policy, for the U.S. Catholic Church since their inception. In Part IV, *The U.S. Catholic Church on Modern Foreign and National Security Policies*, it will become even clearer, through the citation of a series of USCC and NCCB statements and letters, how interactive these two groups are and the roles they play.

THE COLD WAR, REAGAN & THE CATHOLIC TEAM: CATHOLIC INVOLVEMENT COMING TO FRUITION

By the early 1960s and the election of President John Kennedy it was clear the last major barriers to Catholic political equality had been broken down. The national anti-Catholic sentiment and the rumours about the Church had long subsided, though with Kennedy's election came trace amounts of fear that the Vatican would turn him into

³⁶ Benestad, J. Brian and Francis J. Butler. *Quest for Justice: A Compendium of Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops on the Political and Social Order 1966-1980*. National Conference of Catholic Bishops: United States Catholic Conference, 1981. p.78

³⁷ Hanson. [The Catholic Church in World Politics](#). p.179

a puppet for their own agenda. By the time the Vietnam War had ended, however, and Soviet Russia was once again the world's main concern, the Kremlin replaced the Vatican as the principle object of American fears about the forces of evil in the world.³⁸ It was during the 60s and 70s, after Vatican II, and with the realisation of what communism and fascism could do to a society—most notably the quality of human life itself—that the U.S. Catholic Church, working intimately with the Vatican, spent its time developing the cornerstones of what would become its mission on earth, both politically and religiously, for the next century. These cornerstones will later be explored in depth in Parts III & IV: *Motivations for Involvement* and *The U.S. Catholic Church on Modern Foreign and National Security Policies*, respectively.

THE OPPORTUNITY FOR WILSONIANISM DURING THE REAGAN ERA

By the election of Ronald Reagan in 1981, the appointment of his cohorts, the political ascension of like-minded colleagues, and the omnipresent threat of the Soviet Union, the U.S. had certainly developed that “advanced foreign policy” discussed in the historical overview of Part I. The election of Ronald Reagan, and the ascension of like-minded mentalities to key government positions, marked the beginning of another era in the U.S. foreign policy-making process, an era that would be satiated with opportunity for and complement the virtues of any religious fervour stemming from Wilsonianism.

Still, faced with the ideological and cultural threat of Communism, the U.S. found herself fighting an opponent that was now an enemy to many internationally, not just itself. Perhaps, though, the only other state that was as adamant about wiping

³⁸ Meade. *Special Providence*. p.249

Communism from the face of the earth as the U.S. appeared to be was the Vatican State and its Catholic Church. The myriad countries around the world where Catholicism flourished, many of which were in the Eastern parts of Europe and in South America, were threatened by, falling to, or had fallen to Communism. This made eliminating Communism the number one priority for the Vatican and left the air ripe for a joining of forces.

As the Vatican crusaded vociferously against Communism, the Church's mission and message percolated through its churches across the world, particularly in the United States where Catholics had long embraced an anti-communist mentality to profess their "Americanism" around the first World War. As if the planets had been aligning for a Vatican-U.S. relationship—what Carl Bernstein would later describe as "A Holy Alliance"³⁹ in his 1992 *TIME* article—Catholicism happened to be the largest religious group in the U.S. at the time—if Protestantism were broken down denominationally—allowing for the Vatican's message to fall onto many attentive, eager, and ambitious ears.⁴⁰ On top of this, the U.S. saw thousands of Eastern European, Central, and South American Catholic immigrants, attempting to escape the miseries of societies left in shambles from communism, subtly pour into its borders. This gave the already-strong Catholic voice an amplified resonance of passion.

³⁹ Bernstein, Carl. "The Holy Alliance." *TIME Magazine* 24 Feb. 1992: Cover story.

⁴⁰ Source: "Analysing Denominational Families in the U.S." Largest Religious Groups in the United States of America. 7 Dec. 2005. American Religion Data Archive. 22 Nov. 2006
<http://www.adherents.com/rel_USA.html#religions>.

THE HOLY ALLIANCE & THE CATHOLIC TEAM

For President Reagan, religion and faith were not something boxed and stored in the closet upon taking political office, which certainly explained his style of governance and justification of actions. With Reagan's oft-idealistic approach to politics, which *was* founded on his Christian ideals, when U.S. Roman Catholics began calling for an aggressive approach to ridding the world of Communism in an ethical and just manner, it did not fall onto deaf ears.⁴¹ Additionally, in examining the background of the key players in government in Reagan's era—the previously mentioned cohort of the “like-minded”—some of whom stayed in high-ranking positions for the next twenty years though serving in different capacities, it would not take long to realise all of them were Roman Catholics. They were: “A Catholic Team.”

This Catholic Team sincerely recognised the imminent threat from the U.S.S.R. and regarded the administration's relation to the Church, more directly, the Vatican itself, as a “Holy Alliance” indeed. The Team was comprised of CIA chief William Casey (Reagan's Director of Central Intelligence), Richard Allen (Reagan's Deputy Secretary of State, first National Security Advisor, and Secretary of the Interior), William Clark (Reagan's second National Security Advisor), Alexander Haig (Secretary of State), Vernon Walters (Ambassador at Large) and William Wilson (Reagan's first Ambassador to the Vatican). In a later section, entitled *Direct U.S. Catholic Influences on USFP & NSP* (p.65), it will become very clear how the “Catholic Team” utilised its connections with both U.S. clergy-at-large and the Vatican itself in fighting the Cold War.

⁴¹ For a more in depth examination of religion's influence on Reagan, see: Kengor, Paul. God and Ronald Reagan: A Spiritual Life. New York: ReaganBooks, 2004.

While President Reagan's approach to foreign and national security policy often complemented that of U.S. Catholics, there were also times when it did not, such as with Reagan's militaristic national security policies involving Nicaragua, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, and Grenada. Such outcries again articulated a demarcation between what were becoming several camps within the U.S. Catholic laity and clergy, some still avidly militaristic, some completely passive and diplomatic, and everything in between. The "Catholic Team" was an example of the first camp, explaining why, when U.S. Bishops forwarded recommendations for policy change in their direction, they were oft dismissed.

As U.S. Catholics—from the lay citizenry to clergy to key governmental players—began to involve themselves more and more in the foreign policies of the Cold War era, other religious groups—namely the Christian right—began to intensify their efforts as well and follow suit. Given the U.S. Church's resources, however, and its connection with the Vatican in Rome, once the Catholic's foot was in the door of policy-making and had the ear of the President, it became very difficult, if not impossible, for other religious groups or persons in government to try and dominate, impede, or marginalise it—no matter how hard they tried. Evangelicals nonetheless fared quite well, even though, at the time, their resources were not as extensive or historical. And thus, more religious players stepped into the foreign policy arena.⁴²

⁴² It should be noted that in the years prior to World War I there was a temporary Evangelical impulse in both domestic and foreign politics, with William Jennings Bryan serving as a driving force behind this movement. He led campaigns for currency reform, woman's suffrage, and the arbitration of international conflicts. This impulse, however, was short lived and did not possess the grassroots momentum of current Evangelical involvement in FP. For a more extensive examination of the origin of Evangelical involvement in USFP, see Wald, Kenneth D. 2003. Religion and Politics in the United States. Ch 7: The Political Mobilization of Evangelical Protestants (Roots of the "New Christian Right").

The increased U.S. Catholic involvement in both foreign and national security policy-making was perhaps as much luck and circumstance as it was the will of Catholics. The conditions were perfect for such an increase and intermingling: A U.S. president who again exemplified traits of the Wilsonian approach and embraced idealism (Reagan); An international and highly powerful religious entity (The Catholic Church) victimised by a destructive ideology (Communism) while simultaneously being led by a strongly anti-communist (Polish) Pope; And a link between the two—a predominantly Catholic citizenry in the U.S., a motivated USCCB, and a Catholic heavy government.⁴³ This may also help to explain why Catholic involvement under the idealistic President Woodrow Wilson, who possessed many of the same virtues as Reagan, did not come to the fruition as it seemed to around the time of Reagan. Wilson's generation—religious and secular alike—as a draft does not discriminate—were too embroiled, and then exhausted, in world warfare to muster up the will for vigorous involvement. Perhaps, then, another criterion must be added to these perfect conditions: A warless time—or at least a *Cold War*.

⁴³ Denoting key players within both the administration and policy-making process who were Catholic.

PART III

The Doctrinal and Practical

MOTIVATIONS FOR INVOLVEMENT

The historical chronology of U.S. Catholic involvement has been outlined, its role in foreign policy evaluated (though not the success of such a role), and the transition—to fruition—of its role made clear. What beckons to be fleshed out now is *why* the U.S. Catholic Church has been motivated to not only become involved but stay involved in this arena. Beyond the already cited historical reasons for the involvement of the Catholic Church (Catholic nationalism, American patriotism, the victimisation of Catholic countries by communism), there remain a host of other, equally as significant, motives for involvement; and, as the threat of Communism became nonexistent in the early 1990s, those remaining motives were thrust into the light of both understanding and scrutiny.

The core tenets of doctrine and dogma of the Catholic Church have varied little over the centuries, and the U.S. Catholic Church has remained relatively consistent in its interpretation and application of such doctrines. In the late 1970s and early 80s, however, with the accession of Pope John Paul II and the election of Ronald Reagan—both very optimistic, vocal, and progress-oriented leaders—the U.S. Catholic Church, inspired by both of these men, still motivated by the principles and goals of Vatican II, and led by the ambitious assemblage of U.S. Bishops, began to take an even more aggressive role in advancing the mission of the Church and began to do so in a much more public way than ever before. This new approach quickly became apparent through

a series of statements, letters, and conferences, all of which began to publicly enunciate the Church's motives in hopes of inspiring others to become involved as well.

One such document at the cornerstone of this public approach is the United States Catholic Bishops' (USCB) Letter on War and Peace written in May of 1983. Within its hopeful, yet incisive, text lay the statement that had been motivating priests, bishops, cardinals, Popes, and parishes for years, but had remained a mystery to those "on the outside." It boldly stated that, "Faith does not insulate us from the daily challenges of life but intensifies our desire to address them..."⁴⁴ This half of a sentence, resonating with the themes of Vatican II, again emboldened an infinite interest and perpetual passion for the Church's involvement in politics. It was a statement whose message was rooted in the truths of Jesus' *Sermon on the Mount* (MT 7:1) and that helped to set the tone for a new Church in a new time—an international time—through a reaffirmation of involvement. This letter was followed up eleven years later (2004) with an even more detailed, articulate, and motivating document known as *Catholics in Political Life*. Developed by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) Task Force on Catholic Bishops and Catholic Politicians, in collaboration with Francis Cardinal George, OMI, Archbishop Charles J. Chaput, OFM Cap, and Bishop Donald W. Wuerl, it addressed the responsibility of Catholics everywhere—particularly in the United States—to engage civically, politically, philanthropically, and religiously. The Bishops stated,

⁴⁴ United States Catholic Bishops' *Letter on War and Peace*. USCCB. 3 May 1983.

“We [the U.S. Catholic Church] have the duty to teach about human life and dignity, marriage and family, war and peace, the needs of the poor and the demands of justice...The separation of church and state does not require division between belief and public action, between moral principles and political choices, but protects the right of believers and religious groups to practice their faith and act on their values in public life...As bishops, we do not endorse or oppose candidates. Rather we seek to form the consciences of our people so that they can examine the positions of candidates and make choices based on Catholic moral and social teaching.”⁴⁵

Not only did the bishops’ 1983 *Letter on War and Peace* address and remind U.S. Catholics of the political responsibilities in domestic politics but it also set the tone for involvement in American foreign policy for decades to come. As will later be explored, the letter laid the foundation for a series of interests the Catholics would have in the contemporary realms of foreign and national security policy (Part IV); these interests stemmed from the key underlined phrases in the aforementioned excerpt of the later document: *War and peace; The needs of the poor; The demands of justice; And the separation of church and state does not require division between belief and public action, between moral principles and political choices*. From these few clauses was born the motive and direction for U.S. Catholic Church involvement in American foreign and national security policy for the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries.

While such phrases may resonate with nuances of secularity—*social justice, war, peace, and political choices*—many of these concepts are easily grounded within a religious context as well, especially within Catholicism. With renewed energy under Pope John Paul II and President Reagan (though a non-Catholic), came a re-grounding of Catholic belief, one that complemented the secular notion of *raison d’etat* (reason of the state)

⁴⁵ United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: Msgr. William P. Fay. June 2004. *Catholics in Political Life*. Underline added for later reference.

depicted in the historical overview. This re-grounding was, in fact, built on a terra firma of reason and natural law, as it is reason that oft allows for the divinely-ambitious religious principles of Catholics, such as service and servitude, to reach fruition in the secular realms of the policy-making process. It is a combination of this reason with experience—the experience of parishes, the Church, and of intellectuals (both theologians and academics)—that has allowed for the harmonious unification of these secular phrases and religious revelation in the political world. While reason and experience have brought success and comfort for the Catholics, it is an approach that has made Evangelicals and other Protestants rather sceptical and uncomfortable given its “overly-liberal” and emotionless nature. However, Catholics have looked to the disciple Paul for support as well, who affirmed, “Christianity is more than emotional. It engages and renews the mind. Christianity is not anti-intellectual. It is not a matter of feeling overcoming thinking.”⁴⁶ Thus, for Catholics, it is through renewing the mind—with reason, intellect, and experience—that will allow for people to “discern what is the will of God.”⁴⁶

ULTERIOR MOTIVES FOR INVOLVEMENT IN USFP & NSP?

On top of the opportunity to embrace the values of service, servitude, and discipleship through foreign policy, has come the speculation of ulterior motives as well. Ranging from the silly—U.S. Catholics are out to “holify” and proselytise Washington in an imperialistic attempt to spread the power of the Vatican state—to the serious—the

⁴⁶ Danfourth, Senator John. Faith and Politics. How the “Moral Values” Debate Divided America and How to Move Forward Together. Viking Penguin Group (USA), Inc., 2006. p.215.

leader of the Roman Catholic Church is the anti-Christ⁴⁷ and is attempting to seize the world and catalyse a hell on earth through involvement in the world's most power country's foreign policy—a myriad of motives have been advanced. One of the more thought-provoking motives encouraging U.S. Catholic involvement (from the clergy side) in foreign policy was advanced by Jean-Guy Vaillancourt, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Montreal, in *Papal Power: A Study of Vatican Control Over Lay Catholic Elites*.⁴⁸

The study closely examined the sources of papal power and authority. Asserting that papal power is derived mainly from papal *authority*, if the Pope's authority is diminished then papal power is diminished. However, if papal *power* is diminished, then the Pope's authority is likewise undermined, eliciting a cyclical relationship.

Thus, less papal authority means less power and vice versa. With diminishing power, survival of the Roman Catholic institution in its present hierarchical form would be gravely threatened. Ergo, the very survival of the Vatican is threatened by such things as programs to control population growth, efforts to end human rights violations, or the War in Iraq when, on such issues, governments fail to adhere to the advice or mandate of the Vatican.⁴⁹ History has shown that few things motivate more than the need for

⁴⁷ The official interpretation of the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. Source: "Of the Anti-Christ." [The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod](http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=579). Ca 1932. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, N.D. 22 Nov. 2006 <<http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=579>>.

⁴⁸ Vaillancourt, Jean-Guy. [Papal Power: A Study of Vatican Control Over Lay Catholic Elites](#). University of California Press, Berkeley, 1980.

⁴⁹ Mumford, Stephen D. "The Vatican'S Role in the World Population Crisis." *Birth Control Perceived As a Threat to Papal Authority*. NSSM 200, the Vatican, and the World Population Explosion. Main Line Unitarian Church, Philadelphia, PA. 14 Apr. 1996. <<http://www.population-security.org/phil95.htm>>. 22 Nov. 2006

survival. The only way to secure survival, then, is to strengthen relations and advance the morals and social teachings of the Church so that others may come to recognize the importance of their messages.

In April 1992, in an exceedingly rare public admission of the above threat, Cardinal John O'Connor of New York, delivering a major address to the Franciscan University of Steubenville, acknowledged, "The fact is that attacks on the Catholic Church's stance on abortion—unless they are rebutted—effectively erode Church Authority on *all* matters, indeed on the *authority* of himself."⁵⁰ "All matters" certainly includes the national security and foreign policy efforts the Church has put forth over the last century.

This threat was recognised decades ago by the Papal Commission on the foreign policy issue of Population and Birth Control, which met from 1964 through 1966. According to Commission member Thomas Burch, the Pope—Pope Paul VI—himself assigned the Commission the task of finding a way to modify the Church's position on birth control without destroying papal authority—which is essential for the survival of the Catholic Church.⁵⁰ Even after extensive thought and research, the Commission failed to propose a viable alternative, and the result was the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, which banned the use of contraception. This encyclical, which, in theme, will reoccur in Part

⁵⁰ Mumford, Stephen D. "The Vatican's Role in the World Population Crisis." *Birth Control Perceived As a Threat to Papal Authority*.

IV's *Direct U.S. Influences on USFP & NSP*, had a significant effect on the involvement of the Church in the national security arena of population growth and control, and, likewise, the U.S. Catholic Church's influence on NSP.

Few things motivate more than the need for survival, and, while such an intricate, and veiled, motive may not make the floors of most debate forums, it is one that should not go overlooked and should certainly not be ignored. As Catholics draw their moral aspirations and obligations—and thus motives for involvement—from Natural Law, *The Sermon on the Mount*, the works of Jesus, the Epistles of Paul,⁵¹ Vatican II, and the letters and statements of the USCCB and NCCB, it is clear how a healthy grounding in reason and experience has melded with such motives to produce a long history of involvement.

⁵¹ St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: "Since all governments come from God," Christians "must obey the governing authorities" and work through them. Paul saw civil authority as unwittingly assisting his ministry by its establishment of relative peace, physical safety, ease of transportation, and the rule of law.

PART IV
A Contemporary Application

THE U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH ON MODERN FOREIGN AND NATIONAL
SECURITY POLICIES

At the onset of this investigation, a series of questions were raised: How, historically, has the U.S. Catholic Church engaged and interacted with foreign policy and national security? What is motivating this religious group to be involved in the policy arena? What are the strategies, tactics, and areas of focus of the U.S. Catholic Church? And how much influence has the USCCB had on such policies? The first two enquiries have been answered. The latter two, with comparable brevity, are now to be addressed.

When evaluating the influences and impacts of U.S. Catholic Church on American foreign and national security policy, an analysis of strategies, focuses, tactics, and resources must occur to fully understand the depth of the issue. As with the group's motives for involvement, the strategies, tactics, and resources are also diverse, unique, and well-suited for its approach. The hope, prior to the onset of this comparative analysis, is that a clear and tangible concept of influence, and, thus, impact will become apparent as it unfolds. Academic endeavours must at least be hopeful.

STRATEGIES: Goals in, Mission for, and Approach to USFP & NSP.

The U.S. Catholic Bishops, the leading cohort of the Church, have been an integral part in dictating the agenda of the U.S. Catholic Church and the overall manner (strategy) in which it has chosen to engage itself with the government for the last forty

years. Before confusion materialises, it is important to make the distinction between *strategies* and *tactics*, as both aspects will be explored in this section. A strategy is a general plan for accomplishing a goal; it is more conceptual or ideological than intricate and action-based. It is the *overall* mission of the Church or the broad approach adhered to for advancing its agenda. Tactics are the action-arms of the strategy. They are the specific methods or direct approaches to implementing the plan. The strategy is achieved through the employment of the tactics: Tactics→Strategy→Goal. Semantics are rarely enjoyable, but without understanding them, the concept itself is ultimately futile.

As formerly discussed in Part III, *social justice* is the party line of the Catholic Church.⁵² This thematic foundation, as of the mid-twentieth century and Vatican II, has been the groundwork on which Catholics have built their agenda, with the cornerstone of this foundation being *compassion*. The overtone—the primary goal—of U.S. Catholic involvement, then, has been justice with compassion.⁵² Such phraseology resonates from the teachings of Jesus’ life as expressed by not only the canonised Catholic Bible, but every other version as well. Jesus, himself, did not merely proclaim such a goal one day—that he would mould his life around the virtues of justice and compassion—and then do nothing more. Instead, he lived it—every waking, breathing moment. The achievement of such a momentous goal in today’s world comes with no fewer requirements, leaving the Church to follow in Christ’s footsteps and live this goal—every waking, breathing moment.

⁵² Groome, Thomas H. *What Makes Us Catholic. Eight Gifts For Life*. HarperSanFrancisco: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., 2002. Chapter 7, pg. 213.

As a result, each moment became a mission, a mission with a different front. However, each mission was never independent of the ultimate goal; they were never anything more than the collective trials of a battle to resurrect, embrace, and spread compassion through an involvement in foreign and national security policy. To attain this goal, U.S. Catholics focused on three general missions. These missions categorise the *specific issue focuses* that U.S. Catholics involve themselves with in the policy-making process. The first mission revolves around issues of War and Peace. The second is a focus on the dilemma of Global Poverty and all of the intricacies involved therein; and, the third, perhaps the most ideological of the three, is the advancement of Social Justice itself. This triadic approach envelops every aspect of the ultimate goal and reflects a very intimate symbol of the Church: the Cross. Its three upper points (left, top, and right) mirror the missions of the Church, while its base is firmly rooted in the conceptual soils of justice with compassion. A reaffirmation to this goal can be seen every time a Catholic makes the sign of the Cross on their body. In doing so, they are reminded to *live* the missions—and do so “In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

The approach of the U.S. Catholic strategy is, perhaps, what separates it the most from other religious groups, notably that of the Evangelicals—who remain growing players in foreign policy as well. The Catholic strategy is very multilateral. Like the symbolism of the Cross, this is no coincidence either. In fact, Catholicism’s international links as a movement, and its connection with the Vatican in Rome, have made it only easier to mobilise international support for their goal, thus providing higher levels of

success in achieving it.⁵³ The United States itself has a diverse historical portfolio of being multilaterally focused, and it takes only a brief examination of this portfolio before its involvement in and with such groups as the United Nations, NATO, the Red Cross, ANZUS, and the G8 becomes overtly apparent, making this case and point. Save the fact that most of these international bodies would cease to even exist if it were not for the United States, U.S. involvement with I.G.O.s has been extensive. It could easily be asserted that the mentality, minus the post-9/11 era, of the United States has been one of *cooperative security*—working multilaterally to combat threats and bolster international security and prosperity.⁵⁴ From such, it only seems natural that the U.S. Catholic Church has adopted this approach as well and taken up a claim in this moral high ground.

With such a rich and extensive history as the Catholics have, and given the time and outlets the Church has had to tweak and alter its goals and missions, the current approach certainly reflects the understanding that “they get it,”—like France after five revolutions, two dictators, and a coup, the Catholics, too, have figured out what does and does not work. The only aspect that would ever necessitate alteration from this point forward would be its tactics, to complement changing times and resources.

SPECIFIC ISSUE FOCUSES & POSITIONS: Defining the Moral High Ground.

When a mission in foreign and national security policy as general and all-encompassing as *justice with compassion* is coupled with the world’s most complex and

⁵³ Johnston, Douglas. Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Oxford University Press.,1994. Ch.3, p.31.

⁵⁴ Brown, Michael E. America’s Strategic Choices. Revised Ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000. p.4

extensive foreign policy system—that of the U.S.’s, there is almost an unfathomable amount of ways to attempt to fulfil this goal. Post World War II, as America found itself one of only two dominant global powers, and, thus, a major player in the international community, its foreign policy and national security approach did, indeed, come to fruition. With this, the United States found every aspect of every other country under the purview of its foreign policy. Regardless if one agrees with the United States’ approach or not, it can surely not be argued that it has resulted in an almost uncountable number of foreign policy outlets. From the political to the economic and the cultural to the social, there are just shy of infinite issues and concerns that could be addressed, leaving the U.S. Catholic Church with tough decisions to make. On which issues of foreign policy and matters of national security should it resolve to associate itself? After extensive debate, the realisation of where it had the most influence already, and a discussion of the quickest route to bettering the world, it decided to embrace a series of issues. This list focuses on, but is not limited to, the general areas aforementioned in the strategy of the church: issues of war and peace, global poverty, and social justice. The specific issues within these categories that the Church decided to embrace, in no order of significance or priority, are: The Just War Doctrine; Nuclear Weapons; Deterrence, Global Arms Race and Disarmament; the Middle-East Peace Process; the Iraq War; Foreign Aid and Debt Relief; Human Rights; and Religious Freedoms.

THE JUST WAR DOCTRINE

The Just War Doctrine is a philosophical paradigm that outlines when it is and is not acceptable to go to war. An adherence to the Just War Doctrine has become an

integral tool of the Church for promoting peace and grounding decisions in the fertile fields of reason. The Catholic Church has been the longest, and become the largest, proponent of the doctrine of any state or entity in the world due to the doctrine's inherent embracement of morality and ethics. The embracement of such a doctrine has stretched from the life of Jesus to the letters of Pope John Paul II and beyond. In numerous statements released over the years, most recently in a statement on Iraq, the Church has reiterated the importance of this doctrine and the components that comprise it:

On war, “Catholic teaching begins in every case with a presumption against it and for a peaceful settlement of disputes...It believes that every nation has a right and duty to defend itself against unjust aggression...Offensive war of any kind is not morally justifiable...It is never permitted to direct nuclear, or conventional, weapons to the indiscriminate destruction of whole cities or vast areas of populations.”⁵⁵ From just these few premises, a handful of military occurrences from the last century are immediately brought to mind, and judgement unstoppably passed.

On just cause, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* limits just cause to cases in which “the damage inflicted by the aggressor on the nation or community of nations [is] lasting, grave, and certain.”⁵⁶ The Church is against preventive uses of military force to quell growing threats, overthrow threatening regimes, or to deal with weapons of mass

⁵⁵ United States Catholic Conference of Bishops. *Statement on Iraq*. Washington, D.C. 13 Nov. 2002.

⁵⁶ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. #2309.

destruction. As mentioned, offensive war of any kind is not morally justifiable and, therefore, not permitted.

On legitimate authority, as it relates to military recourse, if force were deemed necessary and appropriate, the sanction of such force should come from the United Nations and happen under the auspices thereof.⁵⁷ This premise and interpretation of the JWD (just war doctrine) is a prime example and reflection of the Church's *multi-lateral* approach in foreign policy and national security matters.

On promoting peace, “We [the U.S. Catholic Church] support immediate, bilateral, verifiable agreements to halt the testing, production and deployment of” weapons systems that move the world toward acts of aggression and away from the foundations of peace. Through the bilateral aspect of this interpretation, it again becomes clear how strongly the U.S. Church feels about shying away from unilateralism and embracing multi-lateralism. However, recognising that the world is “devoid of an *adequate* international political authority,”⁵⁸ the Church realises the sheer importance of its involvement in the foreign policy and securities realm of the United States to ensure that the Just War Doctrine is not only abided by but also utilised in every discussion of military aggression.

⁵⁷ Archbishop Jean-Louis Tauran, Vatican Secretary for Relations with States. 10 Sept. 2002.

⁵⁸ United States Catholic Conference of Bishops. *Statement on Iraq*. Washington, D.C. 13 Nov. 2002. Emphasis added.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

As just described, the support for “immediate, bilateral, verifiable agreements to halt the testing, production and deployment of” weapons systems most certainly applies to nuclear weapons systems. The issue of nuclear weapons is one the Catholics have laid claim to since the Cold War era. Over the years, the Church has remained passionate about the issue and spoken intensely about ridding the world of such weapons—not only the Communist or rogue states but the united and democratic states as well. The most infamous and powerful letter the Church has ever written addressed the issue of nuclear weapons and proliferation. In May of 1983 the United States Catholic Bishops’ Letter on War and Peace declared that,

Nuclear weapons are among the most pressing moral questions of our age...We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear war, on however restricted a scale, can be morally justified. Non-nuclear attacks by another state must be resisted by other than nuclear means...Under no circumstances may nuclear weapons or other instruments of mass slaughter be used for the purpose of destroying population centers or other predominantly civilian targets.

Such an ultimatum, delivered to not only the U.S. government but the world itself, is a classic example of an action that, if disobeyed, would undermine the papal authority and, thus, power of the Church, and we have explored the dire consequences of such a cycle if it is repeated too many times. Ironically enough, the uncompromising stance of U.S. Catholics on this issue of mass destruction and elimination from existence may very well serve as the catalyst of the same for them. However, the ultimatum has been upheld since its issuance, and there is no reason to believe, at this point, with the most powerful, well trained, and best equipped armed forces in the world that it is in danger of being broken, though desperate times have called for desperate measures.

DETERRENCE, the ARMS RACE, and DISARMAMENT.

It is indeed hard, and obviously contradictory, to focus on compassion, understanding, and tolerance and attempt to advance such principles in foreign policy while incessantly seeking to acquire more weapons of mass destruction—that are indiscriminate and thus could *never* know compassion or tolerance. Whether these weapons be nuclear, biological, or chemical, the mere fact a country possesses them makes it very difficult for the fullest acceptance of a foreign policy based on such virtues to happen, let alone be successful.

On deterrence, then, U.S. Catholics recognise that it is not “an adequate strategy [for the] long term basis of peace.”⁵⁹ However, not as an end in itself but as a step on the way toward a progressive disarmament, it may still be judged morally acceptable.⁶⁰

On the arms race and disarmament, U.S. Catholics have taken a far more aggressive stand and vociferously articulated their point. The arms race “is one of the greatest curses on the human race; it is to be condemned as a danger, an act of aggression against the poor, and a folly which does not provide the security it promises.”⁶¹ There is certainly no mistaking that message’s point. Likewise, no mistake can be made when interpreting the words of the Church on the process and purpose of disarmament; “...[T]he arms race should cease...the stockpiles which exist in various countries should

⁵⁹ United States Catholic Bishops. *Letter on War and Peace*. 3 May 1983. (Pope John XXIII, “Peace on Earth,” [Pacem in Terris], No. 113.) Nuclear Files: Project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, <<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/ethics/issues/religious/us-catholic-bishops-pastoral-letter.htm>>

⁶⁰ Pope John Paul II, Message to the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, No. 8; June 1982.

⁶¹ Holy See. “The Pastoral Constitution...” No.81; Statement of the Holy See to the U.N., 1976.

be banned...and a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control.”⁶² The rhetoric of “should” reflects the Catholic’s will to constantly raise the bar, and this approach to anything, be it foreign or national security policy or the acts of compassion done in a day, is admirable, commendable, and progressive.

THE MIDDLE-EAST PEACE PROCESS

To choose to involve oneself in an issue of foreign policy and a matter of national security that has proven to be all-but insolvable confirms the resolve of the U.S. Catholic Church as it has chosen to do exactly that. The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict was a major theme of the Clinton Administration while it sought to broker peace among the two nations; however, as George W. Bush came to office the focus on and drive to complete Clinton’s efforts seemed to take the back burner, for Bush had run on a platform that did not reflect a “world policing” mentality but, rather, only very limited and strategic international involvement. Seeing this, and displeased about it, the U.S. Catholic Church urged President Bush in 2003 to continue “to give the peace process the highest priority in order to ensure that Israel and the Palestinians each move forward on the path to peace without delay.”⁶³

Are Catholics drawing motivation from John Lennon’s ode *Give Peace a Chance*? Perhaps a more likely motive is the U.S. Catholic community’s long history of strong ties

⁶² Pope John XXIII, “Peace on Earth,” [Pacem in Terris], No. 112.

⁶³ United States Catholic Bishops. *Letter to President George W. Bush*. 30 May 2003.

to their Arab brothers and sisters. “As part of a universal church, we...have strong ties to Christians in the Holy Land, many of whom are Palestinian. Moreover, through Catholic Relief Services and other aid programs, we are responding to the dire needs of Palestinians of all faiths. We strongly support their legitimate aspirations for an independent, viable state where they can live in dignity and security.”⁶⁴ U.S. Catholic involvement in the issue may very well be one of the few, last strong pushes of any entity or special interest group to rally a unified and ambitious effort for peace between these two nations. Most wouldn’t dare to imagine the result if this were not the case.

FOREIGN AID & DEBT RELIEF

Stemming from such morals outlined in the Beatitudes (the paradigm drawn from the *Sermon on the Mount*), in accordance with the way Jesus lived his life, and in attempts of reaching out to both fellow Christians and non-Christians alike, U.S. Catholics—Catholics of the wealthiest nation in the world—have found themselves with the financial ability and, thus, moral responsibility to reach out to the parts of the world that have been living in impoverished, disease-ridden, and debt-consumed nations; and they have been fulfilling that responsibility notably through the work of Catholic Relief Services (CRS)—the official aid agency of the American Catholic Church.

During the period of intense U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, the U.S. government itself, not to mention innumerable citizens, gave considerable aid to CRS.

⁶⁴ United States Catholic Bishops. Office of Social Development & World Peace. *Letter to President George W. Bush*. 13 April 2004.

Dr. Brian Smith, author of *More Than Altruism: The Politics of Private Foreign Aid*, found that in 1972, ninety-four percent of Catholic Relief Service's budget of \$10.2 million for South Vietnam was material and cash subsidies from U.S. government agencies. Even prior to this, in 1956, U.S. Catholics provided \$201.7 million to support over 5,000 missionaries overseas. By 1958, Catholics and other contributors were sponsoring over 65,000 projects in technical assistance in developing countries, reaching as many as 100,000 people.⁶⁵ The government's direct financial and capital support of CRS is a clear intersection of the U.S. Catholic Church and foreign policy.

The U.S. Catholic Church believes that through foreign aid and debt relief many other foreign policy concerns—population control, terrorism, unstable governments, and disease to name only a handful—can be resolved. During the G8 Summit in July of 2006, President Bush and Prime Minister Blair led the group toward the full cancellation of debt from Africa's poorest countries, a huge step and powerful message of hope. Where partial influence for this impact came from can be articulated in an answer from an interview conducted with Fr. Michael Perry, OFM, of Franciscans International. Perry stated, "The work the Office of International Justice and Peace has done on debt, HIV and AIDS, foreign assistance...needs more work, but the office played a major role in shaping public policy on the issue."⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Smith, Brian. *More Than Altruism: The Politics of Private Foreign Aid*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 1990. pgs. 49 and 64.

⁶⁶ Interview: Fr. Michael Perry, OFM, Franciscans International. 26 November 2006.

Foreign aid and debt relief are safety net approaches to foreign policy; one cannot go wrong in supporting its cause and seeing it through to a reality, for, in the process, many other issues take care of themselves.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The next two specific issues stem from the third mission of the triadic Catholic strategy. Catholicism has a distinct ideology, of which one of the most important components is *social justice*.⁶⁷ Few things address the notion of social justice like human rights. It is one of the cornerstones of the entire concept. Its definition, however, given the enormity of the topic, is not clear nor is it concise. It envelops many areas of many matters in foreign policy. U.S. Catholics feel that one of the most notable and significant areas is the belief that every citizen of every nation has the right to live in dignity and security and to pursue happiness—surely enveloped by the virtues of democracy. In turn, no government has the authority to interfere in said rights or treat citizens in a manner contradictory to these values.

Out of this view on human rights, founded in both religious and political doctrine—the Bible and the Geneva Convention, respectively—Catholics have spent much energy as of late protecting the integrity and well-being of prisoners of war and, the now bewildering term, enemy non-combatants. “Torture violates the basic dignity of the human person that all religions, in their highest ideals, hold dear. It degrades everyone involved—policymakers, perpetrators and victims. It contradicts our nation’s most

⁶⁷ Johnston. Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft. p.32

cherished values. Any policies that permit torture and inhumane treatment are shocking and morally intolerable.”⁶⁸ This view does not alone belong to the Catholics. Among the sixteen other bishops who signed the letter from which this excerpt was taken were Evangelicals, Jews, Lutherans, Methodists, and Baptists. It is an issue that has motivated many groups for a long time. To try and claim that one group has done more or better than any other seems shallow and distasteful with such an issue. Let it simply be noted that U.S. Catholics have made this issue a highest priority and have been integral in motivating governments across the world to address it with an equal vigour.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS

While religious freedoms have been on the edge of the radar for some time, the issue has recently been made a central focus as tensions in the Middle East continue to rise surrounding the Iraq War and conflicts in Lebanon, Israel, and Palestine. The USCCB (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops) has called on Congress to develop policies that will build a better understanding of and engagement with Islamic leaders and promote religious freedom for Christians in countries with Muslim majorities. Showing their seriousness for the issue, more than a general statement of request was made. The USCCB made specific recommendations to move toward these goals. All of these recommendations stemmed from the need of the U.S. government “to make religious liberty even more central to its foreign policy in both practice and policy,” Bishop Wenski

⁶⁸ USCCB: *US Bishops Join Other Religious Leaders to Reject Torture and Uphold Human Rights*. Washington. 2 November 2006.

said. “The U.S. needs to work collaboratively, consistently and intensively with Islamic countries to foster respect for religious liberty in theory and practice.”

The bishops pointed to five specific recommendations for Congress to consider, including: making religious liberty more central to U.S. government foreign policy and practice; engaging religious leaders “more intensively and directly;” participating and supporting in greater measures of “genuine interfaith dialogue;” promoting “concrete reciprocity in policies and practices of law that relate to religious freedom;” and, addressing the underlying social, economic, political, and military issues that “make it easier for opponents of religious freedom to incite religious intolerance.”⁶⁹

Religious freedoms are becoming an equally important variant of human rights and are eliciting the support of many major religious players in the United States. U.S. foreign policy in recent decades has often misread the importance of religion as a factor in the national politics and international behaviour of some countries and regions, and, as a result, this has sometimes led to incorrect analysis and erroneous policy responses that have proven quite costly.⁷⁰ By fostering and protecting religious freedoms in the international community, the policymaking apparatus—and, more importantly, its human components—will come to realise the importance of religion in the governmental

⁶⁹ Catholic Online. *US Catholic Bishops to U.S. Government: Engage with Islam, Protect Religious Freedom*. Catholic news service, 17 March 2006. <http://www.catholic.org>

⁷⁰ Johnston. *Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. p.20

processes of not only other countries but, most importantly, its own.

THE WAR IN IRAQ

The U.S. Catholic Church's involvement in the issue of the Iraq War is a culmination of almost every other specific issue the Church focuses on, and, as such, this issue is the ultimate opportunity to incorporate each mission into one foreign and national security policy. The War in Iraq embodies the Just War Doctrine, weapons of mass destruction—a corollary to nuclear weapons, deterrence, the global arms race, and disarmament—an aspect of the Middle-East peace process, human rights, and religious freedoms. It is the topical application of every other specific area of involvement.

Based on the stances that U.S. Catholics have taken on each of the aforementioned issues, it would not be difficult to interpret the Church's position on the Iraq War. Succinctly, drawing from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' *Statement on Iraq*, the Church has stated that, "Based on the facts that are known to us, we continue to find it difficult to justify the resort to war against Iraq, lacking clear and adequate evidence of an imminent attack of a grave nature."⁷¹ Many questions were present prior to and during the invasion, and the Church did not hold its tongue in attempts of influencing the government's response: "Our assessment of these questions leads us to urge that our nation and the world continue to pursue actively alternatives to war in the Middle East...We support effective enforcement of the military embargo and

⁷¹ United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Statement on Iraq*. Washington, D.C. 13 Nov 2002. The statement was released during the Conference in 2002.

maintenance of political sanctions. We reiterate our call for much more carefully-focused economic sanctions which do not threaten the lives of innocent Iraqi civilians.”⁷²

While an extensive evaluation of the Church’s position on Iraq is not necessary—as the outcome of the war’s execution has already become apparent—it is important to remember that the war in Iraq is the incorporation of every other specific area of interest and the Church continues to provide advice for a course of action in the war based on these principles.

When asked what the five most important FP and NS issues for the Catholic Church were going to be in immediate future, Fr. Michael Perry, OFM, Franciscans International, replied: Iraq, Nuclear Proliferation, HIV/AIDS, Conflicts and Peace building, and Economic Development of developing countries. Only time will tell if he is right or if different, more pressing, issues arise.⁷³

TACTICS OF THE U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH IN USFP & NSP

The tactics of the USCC are almost as bountiful as the issues these tactics serve to advance. As was done at the onset this Part, a quick recap on what tactics are may be in order. Tactics are the action-arms of the strategy. They are the specific *methods* or *direct approaches* to implementing the general plan. The strategy is achieved through the employment of the tactics and the goal is likewise achieved by the success of the strategy.

⁷² USCCB. *Statement on Iraq*. 13 Nov 2002.

⁷³ Interview: Fr. Michael Perry, OFM, Franciscans International. 26 November 2006.

Therefore, on the premises of logic—and a bit of Catholic reason, tactics are the ultimate determinant in the accomplishment of the goal.

The Catholic Church has been around since the death of Jesus. Over the centuries it has had a wealth of experience in not only dealing with and working for the government but, for more than a century, actually being the government—the Holy Roman Empire. In this time, it has sharpened its ability to understand, and the skills necessary for the engaging with, the intricacies and fickleness of the political world. In today’s complex world, there is never only one approach, and U.S. Catholics understand what this means to a “t”—or perhaps a more apt representation of it would be to a “†”.

In the U.S., the media seems to be the most effective manner in which to advocate and create awareness and is, as a result, a central pillar in the parthenon of political tactics. U.S. Catholics, however, have employed every fathomable means possible in advocating and influencing the advancement of their interests and agenda. This list of tactics includes: Letters to political officials—both domestic and international; Published statements declaring official positions and recommending—sometimes demanding—courses of government action; Conferences—religious, business, and press; Relief Services, Charities, and Campaigns (CRS, CCC, CCHD);⁷⁴ and even utilisation of the pulpit to encourage action from the laity. This multi-frontal approach to influencing foreign and national security policy has left no stone unturned and no effort misguided. While each tactic could be explored in depth, and numerous

⁷⁴ CCC: Catholic Communication Campaign. CCHD: Catholic Campaign for Human Development.

examples cited as to how and when such tactics were employed, the only tactics worth further exploration at this point are the letters and statements from the USCCB.

LETTERS & STATEMENTS TO POLITICAL OFFICIALS

While a more complete and historical compilation of U.S. Catholic statements and letters are available in print form,⁷⁵ it is worth citing the most pertinent and notable of these documents in the last few years for a better understanding of how, when, and on what topics that Church has chosen to implement this tactic. As the U.S. continues to engage more and more at the international level with each passing year, the USCCB, *already* the principle mouthpiece and outlet for U.S. Catholic political involvement, continues to become ever more important.

While the list below highlights the major statements issued by the U.S. Catholic Church in the last 20 years, it is only an abridged list that encapsulates the topic focuses of the Church within that period. These statements were positional decrees of morality, ethical behaviour, and suggested policy directions for both the American people and U.S. government. Each time a statement is published and released it is symbolic and representative of the full authority and expectation of the U.S. Catholic Church. They are the USCCB's equivalent of papal encyclicals.

⁷⁵ For letters and statements in print, see: Benestad and Butler. *Quest for Justice: A Compendium of Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops on the Political and Social Order 1966-1980*. 1981.

<u>USCB Statement On:</u>	<u>Date</u>
Pastoral Letter on War and Peace	03 May 1983
Reflection on the Importance of the Just War Doctrine	November 1993
A Declaration on Human Rights	19 March 1998
New Nuclear Treaty and US Nuclear Weapons Policy	24 May 2002
Statement on Iraq	13 November 2002
Reducing Debt of Poor Countries	08 June 2004

Looking at the dates of the above statements, it is not hard to place them within the context of, at the time, ongoing political activities around the globe. While the statements issued by the USCCB carry with them the full authority and expectation of the U.S. Catholic Church, letter writing to government officials is most often done by only select bishops on more focused topics and with more specific suggested policy directives. The below list of letters written by various bishops of the USCCB focus on the topics pertinent only to U.S. foreign and national security policy within the last 10 years and that fall within the triadic strategy outlined earlier in Part IV. Following that list is a numerical total, by category, of the letters written within this time period on a broader range of topics pertinent to international affairs. Take note of which topics have more letters than others:

<u>Letters from USCB to:</u>	<u>On:</u>	<u>Date:</u>
1. Sec. Of State Albright	Crimes Against Humanity (Algeria)	01-26-98
2. Sec. Of State Albright	Iraq- Just War	02-10-98
3. President Bill Clinton	Iraq- Just War	02-13-98
4. Sec. Of State Albright	Human Rights (Africa)	03-19-98
5. Sec. Of Treasury Rubin	Poverty (For G8 Agenda)	05-15-98
6. Nat. Sec. Advisor Berger	Nuclear Weapons (India)	05-18-98
7. Sec. Of State Albright	Human Rights (E. Timor)	06-05-98
8. U.S. Senate	Religious Freedoms (World Wide)	06-05-98
9. U.S. House of Rep.	International Trade (China)	07-21-98
10. Sec. Of State Albright	Human Rights (Pakistan)	12-02-98
11. I.N.S.	Human Rights (Central America)	01-26-99
12. President Bill Clinton	Crimes Against Humanity (Russia)	04-01-99
13. Pres. Slobodan Milosevic	Crimes Against Humanity (Russia)	04-01-99
14. Sec. Of State Albright	Peace (Columbia)	07-27-99

15.	President Clinton	Terror in E. Timor	10-10-99
16.	President Clinton	Israel	11-01-99
17.	U.S. House of Rep.	Debt Relief	03-09-00
18.	Indonesian Ambassador	Religious Freedoms	07-06-00
19.	President George Bush	Just War (and the Bush Doctrine)	09-17-02
20.	Senator	Global Health Crisis (AIDS, Africa)	03-04-03
21.	Senator	H.R. 1298 (AIDS, TB, Malaria)	05-15-03
22.	Sec. Of State Powell	Israel & Palestine	06-02-04
23.	PM of Iraq	Church Bombings (Rel. Freedoms)	08-13-04
24.	Sec. State Powell	Church Bombings (Rel. Freedoms)	08-13-04
25.	Sec. State Powell	Darfur	10-01-04
26.	Pres. G.W. Bush	Global Pov., Int'l Trd., Climate, Arms Trd.	06-28-05
27.	U.S. House of Rep.	Darfur	08-10-05
28.	Sec. State Rice	Darfur	05-11-06
29.	U.S. House & Senate	NSP: US-China Relations	06-02-06
30.	Sec. Of Defence Rumsfeld	Ethical Treatment of Detainees (POW)	06-16-06
31.	U.S. House & Senate	Middle East	07-21-06
32.	Ambassador	Increased Trade and Religious Freedoms	08-25-06
33.	U.S. House of Rep.	Int'l Law, Human Rights (Detainees), GWOT	09-19-06
34.	President G.W. Bush	Mexican Immigration	10-11-06
35.	Sec. Of State Rice	Religious Freedoms (Iraq)	10-30-06

Topic of Letter (International Affairs)

Total Written

1.	<u>Immigration</u>	13
2.	<u>Trade</u>	12
3.	<u>Global War on Terror (GWOT)</u>	11
4.	<u>Debt Relief</u>	10
5.	<u>Human Rights</u>	9
6.	<u>Darfur</u>	8
7.	<u>Religious Freedoms</u>	8
8.	<u>Human Cloning</u>	8
9.	<u>Global Poverty</u>	7
10.	<u>Israel-Palestine</u>	5
11.	<u>Just War</u>	5
12.	<u>Nuclear Weapons</u>	5
13.	<u>Kosovo</u>	5
14.	<u>POWs</u>	4
15.	<u>Global Health</u>	4
16.	<u>Cuba</u>	4
17.	<u>Terror in East Timor</u>	3
18.	<u>Crimes Against Humanity</u>	3
19.	<u>Climate Change</u>	3
20.	<u>Church Bombings</u>	2
21.	<u>Columbia Peace</u>	2
22.	<u>War & Peace</u>	2

23.	<u>Land Mines</u>	2
24.	<u>Haiti, Refugees</u>	2
25.	<u>Foreign Aid</u>	2
26.	<u>International Law</u>	1
27.	<u>Arms Trade</u>	1
28.	<u>US-China Relations</u>	1
29.	<u>Energy Policy</u>	1
30.	<u>Burundi, Congo, Indonesia</u>	1

DIRECT U.S. CATHOLIC INFLUENCES ON USFP & NSP

In looking over the topics of the letters and statements issued by the USCCB in only the last 10 years, and comparing them against U.S. policy approaches and legislation, it is clear that the U.S. Catholic Church was influential in at least getting the government to focus on or increase support for a handful of issues: The International Religious Freedom Act of 1998; The Human Trafficking & Sex Trafficking Legislation of 2000;⁷⁶ The Sudanese Peace Act of 2002; and the North Korea Human Rights Act of 2004.

Of these policy focuses, the most notable and influenced by the U.S. Catholic Church was the International Religious Freedom Act passed by Congress in 1998. The law identifies a wide range of diplomatic and economic tools that might be utilized to encourage freedom of religion and conscience throughout the world as a fundamental human right. The most important of these tools are the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom, and direct U.S. advocacy—by the Office of International Religious Freedom—with foreign governments.⁷⁷ The Office of International Religious Freedom,

⁷⁶ With outcries from religious communities around the country, in 2003, President Bush made the fight against trafficking and slavery an American priority. After declaring to the UN that global action was necessary, President Bush committed \$50 to support the global fight against human trafficking.

⁷⁷ Farr, Tom. *Roots of the International Religious Freedom Report*. US Department of State. Issues of Democracy. An Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of State. Volume 6, Number 2, November 2001. <http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itdhr/1101/ijde/farr.htm>

a new division within the United States Department of State created by the Act, has been charged with monitoring, evaluating, and compiling a ranked list of country's across the world and their statuses on religious freedom. The Act also seeks to promote U.S. assistance to newly formed democracies that implement freedom of religion and conscience. If you will recall, religious freedom has been a specific issue of focus for the USCC for decades (Vatican II) and is an integral part of the U.S. Church's triadic strategy. After perseverant advancement and lobbying for religious freedoms (not limited to the eight letters written on the topic in the last ten years), their efforts and energies finally paid off in a substantial way, and the world is much better off because of it.

Going back more than ten years, and into the Cold War era, when both the Vatican and U.S. vehemently battled the spread and existence of communism, the Catholic Church played an enormous role and had a great influence on U.S. engagement with Soviet Russia. On national security and military questions, American intelligence was better than the Vatican's, but the Church excelled in its evaluations of the political situation, and in understanding the mood of the people and communicating with the Solidarity leadership, the Church was in an incomparable position.⁷⁸ "Our [the Church's] information about Poland was very well founded because the bishops were in continual contact with the Holy See and Solidarnosc," explained Cardinal Silvestrini, the Vatican's deputy secretary of state at the time. "They informed us about prisoners, about the activities and needs of Solidarity groups and about the attitude and schisms in the government."⁷⁸ All of this information was, of course, immediately communicated to

⁷⁸ Bernstein, Carl. *The Holy Alliance*. TIME Magazine. 24 Feb 1992. Special Report.

William Casey (CIA Chief and key player in the administration's "Catholic Team") and the President for a dictation of action.

Beyond the bishops themselves doing espionage during the Cold War, the Pope himself met with American officials to assess events in Eastern European countries and the effectiveness of American actions. On almost *all* of his trips to the Middle East or Europe, Casey first flew to Rome, so that he could meet with Pope John Paul II and exchange information for better-developed policy and courses of action.⁷⁹

If every trip made by a director of national intelligence does not seem to be an indicator of Catholic influence, few other things would meet the qualifications. The same year that women's reproductive freedom gained new ground with the success of *Roe v. Wade*, U.S. foreign policy on the issue changed with the enactment of the Helms Amendment. Anti-abortion Senator Jesse Helms, with the support of U.S. Catholics, introduced the Helms Amendment in 1973, which ruled out abortion assistance in all U.S. foreign aid programs. The Helms Amendment not only denied women overseas abortion services through U.S. funded programs but set the stage for future restrictions through USFP.

Another very notable influence U.S. Catholics have had on national security policy is evident in the history of National Security Study Memorandum 200—a definitive interagency study of the threat of overpopulation to U.S. and global security. In March of 1970, the U.S. Congress created The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (The Rockefeller Commission). The Commission completed

⁷⁹ Bernstein. *The Holy Alliance*. 1992.

its work by March of 1972. In its final report, the Commission strongly recommended more than 70 courses of action for dovetailing population growth for the sake of U.S. national security. Collectively, and if they were employed together, the recommendations constituted a superb blueprint for a national security policy. In 1972, however, when the plan was given to the President Nixon, who was facing re-election, he greatly distanced himself from the report. Why? “The reasons were obvious,” noted Congressman James Scheuer (D-NY). “It was the fear of attacks from the far right and from the Roman Catholic Church because of our positions on family planning and abortion”⁸⁰

In the end, none of the Commission’s 70 recommendations were ever implemented. The results of a successful interagency study—which, if anyone understands the politics of Washington they understand how very few and far between a *successful* interagency study is—were left to gather dust on a shelf somewhere in Washington. What had gone wrong? Rockefeller, chair of the Committee, responded, “The greatest difficulty [had] been the very active opposition by the Roman Catholic Church through its various agencies in the United States.”⁸⁰

When these handfuls of policy influences are coupled with the impacts of a hugely influential “Catholic Team,” an enormously resourceful, wealthy, and highly active conglomerate of national and global charity and relief services, intimate involvement during the Cold War, and a long history of nationalistic and patriotic efforts conducted from WWI through Vietnam, it becomes clear that U.S. Catholics have not only found

⁸⁰ Mumford, Stephen D. National Security Study Memorandum 200: World Population Growth And U.S. Security THE SOCIAL CONTRACT. Vol. III, No. 2. Winter 1992-93. 1993.

and seized every opportunity to play an influential role in U.S. foreign and national security policy in the last one hundred years but have been hugely successful, comparatively, in doing so. While influence and impact on such a topic can oft be difficult to materially and conclusively represent, there is little doubt that ideologically, religiously, culturally, and politically the U.S. Catholic Church will continue to play a role in the political arena, working to advance, through foreign and national security policies, the ideals and principles which peoples of all nations and faiths can live by.

FUTURE INFLUENCES

As this article concludes, what becomes the focus now is the future. Barry Rubin, contributing author of Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft, offered his perspective on the future influences of U.S. Roman Catholics:

The next generation of Catholic influence may very well be unfolding within the realms of the judiciary. With President Bush having the historic opportunity to appoint not one but two U.S. Supreme Court Justices, the balance of religious power in this country may have just swung back toward the Catholics. Both John Roberts and Samuel Alito are devout Roman Catholics, and after their confirmation by the Senate, five of the nine justices on the bench are now Catholics. For an institution that has been purported to be the most powerful group in the United States government, such a reality may have dramatic effects on not only the separation of church and state but also the direction and acceptance of U.S. foreign policy.

With Rubin's remarks, it would appear as though the era of a new "Catholic Team" is upon us. The influences and impacts of the Church in the next century will only be apparent with time and patience. The only thing that is certain is that the U.S. Catholic Community will continue striving vigorously to ensure the world becomes a better place to live, in condition and principle, as it is clearly their nature.

Bibliography/References:

- Abbot, S.J., Walter M. The Documents of Vatican II. New York: Herder & Herder, 1966.
- Albright, Madeleine. The Mighty & The Almighty. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, 2006.
- Benestad, J. Brian and Francis J. Butler. *Quest for Justice: A Compendium of Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops on the Political and Social Order 1966-1980*. National Conference of Catholic Bishops: United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1981.
- Bernadine, Joseph Cardinal. A Moral Vision for America. *The Catholic Moral Vision in the United States (pp. 144-157)*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1998.
- Bernstein, Carl. "The Holy Alliance." TIME Magazine, 24 Feb. 1992: Cover story.
- Brown, Michael E., Cote, Owen R., Lynn-Jones, Sean M., and Miller, Steven E. America's Strategic Choices. Revised Ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- Bryce, James. *The American Commonwealth*. New York: Macmillan Company. Vol. II. 1927.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church. #2309.
- Catholic Online. *US Catholic bishops to U.S. government: Engage with Islam, Protect Religious Freedom*. www.catholic.org. Catholic News Service. 17 March 2006.
- Dallek, Robert. The American Style of Foreign Policy, Cultural Politics and Foreign Affairs. New York: New American Library, 1983.
- Danfourth, Senator John. Faith and Politics. How the "Moral Values" Debate Divided America and How to Move Forward Together. Viking Penguin Group (USA), Inc., 2006.
- Dohen, Dorothy. Nationalism and American Catholicism. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1974.
- Farr, Tom. *Roots of the International Religious Freedom Report*. US Department of State. Issues of Democracy. An Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of State. Volume 6, Number 2, November 2001. <http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itdhr/1101/ijde/farr.htm>
- Gaddis, John Lewis. Surprise, Security, and the American Experience. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Gray, Colin S. The Sheriff: America's Defense of the New World Order. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2004.
- Groome, Thomas H. What Makes Us Catholic. *Eight Gifts For Life*. HarperSanFrancisco: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc. 2002.

- Hannah, Mary T. Catholics and American Politics. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Hanson, Eric O. The Catholic Church in World Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Hastedt, Glenn P. American Foreign Policy: Past, Present, Future. Sixth Ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2006.
- Hennesey, James. American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Himes, Kenneth R. (OFM) Vatican II and Contemporary Politics. Georgetown Press. 2006
- Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform. New York, NY: Vintage, 1965.
- Holy See. "The Pastoral Constitution..." No.81; Statement of the Holy See to the U.N., 1976.
- Interview: Fr. Michael Perry, OFM, Franciscans International. 26 November 2006.
- Johnston, Douglas, and Cynthia Sampson. Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft. Center for Strategic and International Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Kengor, Paul. God and Ronald Reagan: A Spiritual Life. New York: Reagan Books, 2004.
- Klingberg, Frank. Positive Expectation's of America's World Role. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996.
- Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. Source: "Of the Anti-Christ." The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. Ca 1932. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, N.D. 22 Nov. 2006. <http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=579>
- Mead, Walter R. "God's Country." Foreign Affairs. 85.5 (Sept/Oct 2006): 24-43.
- Mead, Walter R. Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World. New York: Taylor & Francis Books, Inc., 2002.
- Mumford, Stephen D. National Security Study Memorandum 200: World Population Growth And U.S. Security THE SOCIAL CONTRACT. Vol. III, No. 2. Winter 1992-93. 1993.
- Norrander, Barbara, and Clyde Wilcox. Understanding Public Opinion. Ch. 7: American Foreign Policy and Public Opinion in a New Era: Eleven Propositions. Second Ed., Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2002.
- Olen, Jeffrey, and Julie C. Van Camp, and Barry Vincent. Applying Ethics. Eighth Ed., Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning, Inc., 2005.

- Perkins, Dexter. The American Approach to Foreign Policy. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
- Pope John Paul II. Message to the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, No. 8. June 1982.
- Pope John XXIII. "Peace on Earth" [Pacem in Terris], No. 112. April 11, 1963.
<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html>
- Professor L. Colucci, Politics Department, Ripon College. Foreign Service Officer Emeritus. Seoul, South Korea Desk, Seoul Embassy. Lecture on U.S. National Security Policy. Ripon College, Ripon, WI. 2006-08-23, Wed.
- Professor L. Colucci, Politics Department, Ripon College. Foreign Service Officer Emeritus. Seoul, South Korea Desk, Seoul Embassy. Wed. Lecture on U.S. Foreign Policy. Ripon College, Ripon, WI. 2005-01-18
- Roy, Jody M. *Rhetorical Campaigns of the 19th-c: Anti-Catholics & Catholics in America*. Lewiston NY: Edwin Mellen, 2000.
- Smith, Brian. More Than Altruism: The Politics of Private Foreign Aid. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Snow, Donald M. National Security for a New Era: Globalisation and Geopolitics. Second Ed. New York, NY: Pearson Longman: University of Alabama, 2007.
- Thomas, Scott M. The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations: the Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-First Century. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- United States Catholic Bishops. *Letter on War and Peace*. 3 May 1983. (Pope John XXIII, "Peace on Earth," [Pacem in Terris], No. 113.) Nuclear Files: Project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, <<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/ethics/issues/religious/us-catholic-bishops-pastoral-letter.htm>>.
- United States Catholic Bishops. *Letter to President George W. Bush*. 30 May 2003.
- United States Catholic Bishops. Office of Social Development & World Peace. *Letter to President George W. Bush*. April 13, 2004.
- United States Catholic Bishops. *Letter on War and Peace*. USCCB. May 3, 1983
- United States Catholic Conference of Bishops. *Statement on Iraq*. Washington, D.C.: Nov. 13, 2002.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: Msgr. William P. Fay. *Catholics in Political Life*. June 2004.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Office of Media Relations. *US Bishops Join Other Religious Leaders to Reject Torture and Uphold Human Rights*. Washington, D.C., November 2, 2006. <http://www.catholicsfordemocracy.org/archive/node/7342>

Vaillancourt, Jean-Guy. Papal Power: A Study of Vatican Control Over Lay Catholic Elites. University of California Press, Berkley, 1980.

Wald, Kenneth D. Religion and Politics in the United States. Fourth Ed., New York: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003.

Internet Sources:

"Analysing Denominational Families in the U.S." Largest Religious Groups in the United States of America. 7 Dec. 2005. American Religion Data Archive. 22 Nov. 2006 http://www.adherents.com/rel_USA.html#religions

All research contained within was conducted prior to May 2007.

