



Kirke og stat

Det amerikanske midtvejsvalg står for døren, og mange katolske politikere søger enten nyvalg eller genvalg. Dette bringer på ny spørgsmålet om forholdet mellem kirke og stat på bane. Men at det ikke kun er i USA, spørgsmålet er aktuelt, viser pave Benedikt XVI's taler under sit nylige besøg i Storbritannien. Her er en artikel om emnet, trykt i det amerikanske magasin *National Catholic Reporter* (noget forkortet), efterfulgt af en redaktionel kommentar.

JFK and the cafeteria bishops

50 years after Kennedy asserted independence from the pope, tide has turned

NCR Aug. 10, 2010

By Patrick J. Reardon



Sen. John F. Kennedy partakes in a question-and-answer session with the Greater Houston Ministerial Association on Sept. 12, 1960, in Houston. It was on this occasion that Kennedy addressed concerns about his Catholicism and his run for the presidency.

Analysis

A half century ago, John F. Kennedy was elected the first Catholic president of the United States because he convinced American voters that he wouldn't take orders from the pope.

Now, however, Catholic politicians across the United States, particularly those running for national office, are increasingly facing criticism from some members of the hierarchy -- because they won't take orders from the church.

Consider:

- In 1984, Geraldine Ferraro, a Catholic, was the Democratic nominee for vice president and the first woman on a major party's national ticket. But Bishop James Timlin



of Scranton, Pa., and Archbishop John O'Connor of New York publicly rebuked her for advocating legalized abortion.

- In 1990, O'Connor, now a cardinal, warned Catholic politicians that they were “at risk of excommunication” if they didn’t oppose abortion.
- In 2003, Archbishop Sean O’Malley of Boston told Catholic lawmakers that they should stop receiving Communion if they voted to approve abortion legislation.
- In 2004, Massachusetts Sen. John Kerry was named to head the Democratic ticket, becoming the first Catholic since Kennedy to be nominated for president. But, earlier in the year, less than a week before the Missouri primary, Archbishop Raymond Burke of St. Louis told reporters that he would refuse Communion to Kerry because of the politician’s support of abortion rights.

But it’s not just today’s Catholic politicians who are being targeted by this small corps of activist bishops. Even Kennedy, dead now for almost 47 years, is being attacked.



Archbishop Charles Chaput of Denver has been taking the late president to task in print and in public for at least six years, most recently in an address at Houston Baptist University on March 1.

He even injected himself into Kerry’s 2004 presidential run with a column in the diocesan newspaper, with little more than a month to go before the election, blasting retrospectively Kennedy and former New York Gov. Mario Cuomo, a Catholic who sought the Democratic presidential nomination in 1984, for “making a deal with the devil.”

Chaput summarized the Kennedy-Cuomo approach to politics as “it’s OK to be Catholic in public service as long as you’re willing to jettison what’s inconveniently ‘Catholic.’ ” He slammed Cuomo for his support of abortion funding for poor women, and said Kennedy set a template for his coreligionist politicians: “Be American first, be Catholic second.”

Then, with a pointed jab, the archbishop wrote, “This was an easy calculus for Kennedy, who wore his faith loosely anyway.”

That certainly seems true. Kennedy was a womanizer who never gave the impression of devoutness, although he liked to be seen in the company of Cardinal Richard Cushing of Boston.

Other presidents of that era didn’t trumpet their faith either.



Still, no one knows what's in a person's heart. Were Kennedy's efforts on behalf of civil rights the result of his Catholic upbringing and affiliation? What about his work to limit nuclear weapons testing?

During the 1960 campaign, Kennedy made it clear, in a speech to a group of Protestant ministers in Houston, that, in running the nation, he would be his own man:

I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute -- where no Catholic prelate would tell the president (should he be a Catholic) how to act and no Protestant minister would tell his parishioners for whom to vote. ... I believe in an America that is officially neither Catholic, Protestant nor Jewish -- where no public official either requests or accepts instructions on public policy from the pope, the National Council of Churches, or any other ecclesiastical source.

The idea of a Catholic as the nation's chief executive had long been a scary threat to many Americans. Indeed, during the campaign of Democrat Al Smith, the first Catholic nominee for the presidency in 1924, a Methodist bishop declared: "No governor can kiss the papal ring and get within a gunshot of the White House."

Kennedy calmed those fears by his refusal to proselytize -- or lead -- on behalf of his faith.

As he said in the Houston speech, "I am not the Catholic candidate for president. I am the Democratic Party's candidate for president, who happens also to be a Catholic."

Kennedy's election was the result of -- and helped accelerate -- great changes that had been taking place within the United States. No longer were Catholics an immigrant bloc, poorly educated and fit for little more than hard labor. By 1960, they were well on their way to assimilating fully into the national fabric, solidly middle-class and increasingly suburban.

True, in that year, they gave 83 percent of their votes to their fellow Catholic. But ever since, they have tended to split their ballots, reflecting the liberal-conservative divide in the country.

For instance, Catholics gave majorities to Democrats Jimmy Carter (57 percent) in 1976 and Bill Clinton (53 percent) in 1990, but, in other years, Republicans came out on top, such as Ronald Reagan (51 percent in 1980 and 55 percent in 1984).

One measure of the assimilation of American Catholics is Joe Biden.

In taking the oath as vice president in January 2009, Biden became the first Catholic to serve in that office. Hardly anyone considered it a watershed of any sort (especially given the true national significance of the election of his running mate, Barack Obama, as the first African-American president). Certainly no one paid much attention.

Initially, after Kennedy's victory, it was the fashion for the national parties to nominate Catholics for the vice presidency -- Republican William Miller in 1964 and Democrats Ed-



mund Muskie in 1968 and Sargent Shriver in 1972. But after that, until Biden, the only other Catholic VP nominee was Ferraro.

That's because Catholics weren't voting for Catholics anymore simply on the basis of religion. In fact, when the only other Catholic, Kerry, ran for the presidency in 2004, his opponent, incumbent George W. Bush, won the Catholic vote with 52 percent.

Religious labels

Since John F. Kennedy's election, the label "Catholic" hasn't scared away voters. In most races, it's been a non-issue, hardly mentioned amid discussions of the candidate's programs and policies.

That's a trend, however, that Chaput finds ominous -- and for which he blames Kennedy.

Kennedy's speech in Houston "left a lasting mark on American politics," said Chaput in his March 1 address, also in that Texas city. "It was sincere, compelling, articulate -- and wrong ... wrong about American history and very wrong about the role of religious faith in our nation's life."

Chaput argued that Kennedy wrongly stood for a strict separation of church and state, and he said Kennedy's "remarks profoundly undermined the place not just of Catholics, but of all religious believers, in America's public life and political conversation." The speech "began the project of walling religion away from the process of governance in a new and aggressive way."

Yet, religion has hardly been "walled away" from American discourse over the past half century.

In fact, the major story of U.S. politics since Kennedy's time has been the rise of faith-based activism. Consider how many "born-again" politicians have won office, and the role of "moral values" in campaign debates.

The roots of this go back to the 1970s. In the wake of the Watergate scandal and Nixon's resignation as president, the United States underwent a profound loss of innocence. The nation's leadership was found to be corrupt and venal. The sense of American goodness -- a moral superiority to other nations -- was shaken to the core.

Meanwhile, in 1973, the Supreme Court ruled in **Roe v. Wade** that abortion was a constitutional right, energizing conservative Christians and Orthodox Jews to enter the political arena in opposition.

Savvy politicians on the right saw in these developments a chance to gain and keep political power.

Faith, as a cure for secular corruption, was the selling point, but not a religious belief system. Instead, strategists realized that, by exploiting a handful of hot-button issues -- abor-



tion and same-sex marriage, in particular -- they could marshal entire armies of single-issue voters and sway elections.

And they did.

Not that winning elections resulted in drastic changes in the national landscape.

“And what does the religious right have to show for its identification of faith with the political process?” asks Randall Balmer, a religious history professor at Columbia University in New York and an Episcopal priest, in **God in the White House: A History**, published in 2008.

“Precious little. The leaders of the religious right have failed to outlaw abortion, their signature issue since 1980, and this despite the fact that the Republicans have controlled both the White House and Congress for most of those years.”

From a practical political point of view, outlawing abortion would eliminate this powerful electoral tool. As long as abortion remains in the law books, conservative strategists have a potent issue to throw at more moderate opponents.

Entering the political fray

This is the context in which some Catholic prelates have entered the political fray.

And, like the religious right, the bishops have tended to use their threats of excommunication for only a handful of issues, mainly abortion, but not for others.

For instance, few if any bishops who publicly castigated Catholic politicians for funding abortion services made any threats against politicians who backed the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 -- even though Pope John Paul II spoke out against it: “No to war! War is not always inevitable. It is always a defeat for humanity.”

Similarly, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a statement in 1980 that “the legitimate purposes of punishment do not justify the imposition of the death penalty.” Yet, few members of the hierarchy who rail against same-sex marriages and abortion have had much to say about politicians who promote execution in the name of society.

In fact, back in 2004, when Chaput in Denver blasted Kennedy and Cuomo for failing to be Catholic enough in their governmental decisions, he took a particular swipe at the former New York governor. Although Cuomo did nothing to restrict abortion, the archbishop wrote with apparent sarcasm, “his Catholic conscience apparently did kick in [on the death penalty].”

Cuomo, Chaput wrote, “vetoed legislative efforts to reinstate the death penalty -- **12 times.**”



Except for slamming Cuomo, Chaput's point was a little unclear. One reading of it is that, according to the archbishop, Cuomo should have done something to protect fetuses and also done something to get his state back into the business of putting prisoners to death.

Or maybe, to give the statement a more positive reading, Chaput was just saying that, if Cuomo followed the church's death penalty teachings, he should also follow its stand against abortion. In other words, a Catholic politician shouldn't pick and choose.

That's not a new complaint. In fact, the hierarchy has railed against the vast majority of American laypeople since the late 1960s when they rebelled en masse against the Vatican's anti-birth control fiat.

Catholics who pick and choose are, critics assert, "cafeteria Catholics."

Yet, by entering the political debates with selective threats of excommunication and refusal of Communion, the prelates have been picking and choosing what parts of the church's moral teaching they'll stress -- and which parts they'll ignore.

In other words, they've been cafeteria bishops.

It's important to remember that moral teaching doesn't only come from church officials. Think of the former Italian soldier Francis of Assisi or the U.S. social activist Dorothy Day or the former herdsman Patrick who became a missionary to Ireland.

Or think of all the many people whose example or words or insights feed the faith of those around them.

Or think of an American politician of five decades ago.

In September 1960, in his Houston speech, John F. Kennedy -- flawed sinner that he was -- made a simple but profound statement: "I do not speak for my church on public matters, and the church does not speak for me."

There is still much moral wisdom in what he said.

[Patrick T. Reardon is a freelance writer living in Chicago.]

Private beliefs and public acts

An NCR editorial

Aug. 10, 2010

Archbishop Charles Chaput has characterized President John F. Kennedy's 1960 address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association as "sincere, compelling, articulate -- and wrong" ([See story](#)). It would be easier to agree with the archbishop if his own arguments were not also wrong, and wrong in ways that will prove as unfruitful for the future of Catholicism's relationship with American culture as he claims Kennedy's arguments were.



Chaput is one of those conservative thinkers who make extravagant claims for the religiosity of the American founding. In responding to Kennedy's call for an "absolute" separation of church and state, Chaput says: "The trouble is, the Constitution doesn't say that. The founders and framers didn't believe that. And the history of the United States contradicts that. Unlike revolutionary leaders in Europe, the American founders looked quite favorably on religion." This reading of history is something less than accurate. Anytime someone refers to "the founders" the first question is always, "Which founder?" Jefferson, the most philosophically inclined of the founders, certainly believed in an absolute separation of church and state, as did Thomas Paine, who was probably the most influential founder, although he never sat in Congress.

There is a deeper problem however. The American founding presents itself to Chaput and others as a religious event only because it occurred in the brief heyday of Deism. The God that most of the founders worshiped set the world a-going, but he was not inclined to interfere in the lives of men and women. Americans today are more likely than not to worship one kind of interfering God or another. This is important because the purpose of the constitutional separation of church and state was to keep theological disputes from interfering with the business of government, and vice versa. The Protestant ministers Kennedy addressed were themselves content with theological influence on government provided that influence came from their own traditions, but they were hostile to the idea of Catholic ideas shaping the government, a hostility that is well documented in the writings of such founders as traditionalists like John Jay and John Adams, as well as firebrands like Jefferson and Paine.

Yet, Chaput is clearly advocating theological interference in politics. And he is right to do so. Kennedy was wrong to draw such a sharp distinction between his personal, private beliefs and his public acts. Strangely, Chaput prefaced his indictment of Kennedy by noting that he himself was not speaking as an archbishop but as a citizen, making precisely the kind of distinction for which he then faults Kennedy.

Still, Chaput is right to wonder: If the actions and policies of men and women in public life are not shaped by their beliefs, what does shape those actions and policies? Indeed, one of America's finest political achievements was the passage of the Civil Rights Act. That law was deeply influenced by the "private, personal beliefs" of leaders like the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and Rosa Parks. Chaput should, however, acknowledge that Kennedy's use of the word **privacy** was different, at least in legal significance, from the term as it was subsequently employed by the Supreme Court.

In the years after **Roe v. Wade**, many Catholic legislators would invoke Kennedy's distinction between private beliefs and public acts and say, "You can't legislate morality." But, of course, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a very specific legislation of morality. When Mario Cuomo argued in 1984 that a moral consensus must exist if morally fraught legislation is to be passed, he misunderstood the degree of opposition to the Civil Rights Act that existed in the South: There was no consensus. Chaput is right to insist that there is nothing per se objectionable to a politician's moral vision influencing his or her political stances.



We at **NCR** agree with Chaput that the perceived gulf between religion and politics that Kennedy suggested may have been necessary for his election in 1960, but it is not necessary for the flourishing of the American Republic. Indeed, the active involvement of religiously inspired citizens and politicians holds out the possibility of enriching our nation's political discourse precisely because the Gospel always stands in solidarity with the poor and in critique of the culture, especially of the powerful within a culture. We only wish that the archbishop were as suspicious of his own conclusions as he is of Kennedy's. His presuppositions are not shared by many of his fellow citizens and he needs to be mindful of that fact if he seeks to persuade them. For while it is undoubtedly the case that the conscience of a Catholic must be informed by the teachings of the church, it is also the case that the legitimate use of the coercive power of law in a pluralistic society is a more complicated thing than Chaput allows. Clerics in the public square should exhibit humility as well as clarity.