

THE U.S. BISHOPS' PASTORAL LETTER "ECONOMIC JUSTICE FOR ALL"
TWENTY YEARS AFTER
Third Annual University of St. Thomas Summer Institute
June 2, 2006

Most Rev. Ricardo Ramírez, C.S.B.
Bishop of Las Cruces, New Mexico

I. FIRST STEPS

The idea of the Pastoral Letter, "Economic Justice for All", began with a modest proposal by the Auxiliary Bishop of Hartford, Bishop Rosazza. His proposal came after a motion by Archbishop Phillip Hannan of New Orleans to do a pastoral letter condemning Marxist socialism had been accepted by the U.S. Bishops. Bishop Rosazza explained that if the bishops were to do a letter on communism, they should also do a letter on capitalism. The timing favored approval of this idea – it came just before lunch! There was little debate and the motion passed unanimously. This was in November of 1980 and it would take six years before the final draft was approved.

In January 1981 Archbishop John Roach, then President of the U. S. Bishop's Conference, appointed the committee: Archbishop Rembert Weakland, O.S.B. of Milwaukee, as Chairman, and as members Bishop William Weigand of Salt Lake City, Bishop Peter Rosazza Auxiliary of Hartford, Bishop George Speltz of Saint Cloud and Bishop Daly of Greensborough. After Bishop Daley died a few months later he was replaced by Bishop Thomas Donellan of Atlanta.

The staff at the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) included Father J. Bryan Hehir, Secretary of the Office of Social Development and World Peace and the following members of his office: Mr. Ronald T. Krietemeyer, Director, Office of Domestic Social Development, Rev. William M. Lewers, CSC, Director, Office of International Justice and

Peace, and Mr. Thomas Quigley, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Office of International Justice and Peace.

Consultants included David Hollenbach, S.J., Moral Theologian at Weston School of Theology, Donald Warwick, Professor of International Development from Harvard, Charles Wilbur, Professor of Economics, University of Notre Dame, Father John Donohue, S.J., Biblical Scholar, Jesuit School of Theology, Berkely, and Msgr. George Higgins, Lecturer at Catholic University of America.

The first meeting was held in the summer of 1981 and it was decided that the letter would not be on capitalism but on the wider topic of the U.S. economy. It was originally thought that the letter would be a short statement of 4,000 to 5,000 words.

Archbishop Weakland recalls that “the committee appointed had to unravel just what was possible and what the bishops wanted. It was impossible to write a letter on capitalism like the one on communism since there were too many conflicting theories about capitalism from Milton Friedman to John Kenneth Galbraith. Also, the bishops did not possess the expertise to write a theoretical analysis of capitalism and draw out its pastoral implications. The committee, after much difficult debate, decided to write about U.S. capitalism as a social phenomenon and not about capitalism in philosophical terms.”¹

What helped enormously in the process was the experience gained in the writing of the pastoral letter, “The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response.” That process introduced a strong consultative approach, wherein experts and others knowledgeable in the field of war and peace were heard. Hearings for the pastoral letter on the economy were organized throughout the United States and involved professors of economics, bankers, entrepreneurs,

farmers, labor union leaders and members, community organizers and others who work with the poor.

Among those invited and who accepted the invitation to the hearings were economists, including several Nobel prize winners, notably James Tobin, Nobel Laureate in Economics of 1981, and Lawrence Kline of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, Nobel Laureate in Economics in 1980. The committee also interviewed Charles Schultze, economic advisor to President Carter.

The hearings had a simple format. Archbishop Weakland would ask the question, “If you were a bishop, what would you say about the economy?” Ron Krietemeyer remembers the Archbishop’s casual style and the hearings being “civil and smooth.”² Some bishops such as Archbishop John Roach of St. Paul-Minneapolis held hearings with their parishioners. Forms were distributed throughout the country to be filled out. There were 10,000 responses! Truly this letter inspired and created more discussion than any other since the peace pastoral of 1983. The writing of the economic pastoral, however, involved more consultation than any other writing endeavor of the U.S. bishops.

The committee received a great deal of material from those who wanted to contribute to the project. Special hearings were organized in New York by the World Council of Churches and by the Jewish community. The Jewish scholars and rabbis reacted favorably with the letter’s treatment of the Biblical themes on mercy and justice. Bishop Rosazza quotes one of the rabbis present at the Jewish hearing and a survivor of the holocaust: “Indifference to human suffering is the height of sacrilegious behavior.”³

Representatives of principal Jewish organizations emphasized that in their Talmudic tradition, individuals and governments have a duty to care for the needs of the poor. “Jewish law

resorts to coercive measures when personal charity does not meet the needs of the public good,” noted Rabbi Walter Wurzbarger, chairman of Interreligious Affairs of the Synagogue Council of America. “The free-marketing system cannot be relied upon exclusively to ensure the well-being of all human beings.”⁴

Hugh Nolan, Editor of “Pastoral Letters of the U.S. Catholic Bishops, Volume V,” records that in his 1984 Labor Day Statement, then Archbishop O’Connor of New York rejected the view that the bishops were intruding in political affairs. “Rather,” he said, “[the Church] is seeking to make clear the human and moral consequences of the technical choices we make as a nation. Catholic social teaching is neither widely known nor understood,” O’Connor stated, claiming this pastoral letter “will provide the opportunity to raise up this *buried treasure* and dust off its many valuable contents.”⁵

II. THE FIRST DRAFT

It is important to note that the U. S. Bishops were to meet, as they usually do, the second week of November, just days after a presidential election. Because the bishops did not want to be accused of seeking to influence the election the first draft was embargoed until after the election. This made it difficult for the bishops to discuss the letter at the November 1984 meeting since they had received it on the eve of their meeting.

There was much anticipation as well as suspicion regarding this first draft. It was feared that it would be a strong attack against the economic policies of the Reagan administration. It was also feared that the U.S. bishops would come across as hostile to capitalism. A group of Catholic businessmen and other prominent lay persons produced their own pastoral letter in anticipation of an expected anti-capitalist tone of the bishops’ draft. A copy was sent to every pastor in the U.S. According to Archbishop Weakland, “This was both a help and a hindrance.

It gave our own letter much publicity. Every time members of our committee were asked to appear on public TV, they were pitted against a member of this lay committee. On the other hand, many of the lay economists and theologians who had appeared at the hearings were upset that their point of view might be lost in this debate or that the letter of this lay committee might be considered the only lay opinion on the matter. That letter did not influence the bishops much since during the next year the number of hearings increased, the amount of written material submitted became more precise since the first draft was now available.”⁶

Michael Novak, Vice Chairman of that group, complained that the bishops’ draft read “more like the platform of a political party than like a moral statement.” Its tone, he said, is “whiney”. The lay committee argued that the bishops’ emphasis on income distribution disregards the major contribution that economic growth, made possible by capitalism, can make in helping the world’s poor. After the first draft was released, Mr. Novak acknowledged that the draft was in many respects more “pro-capitalist” than earlier Church pronouncements.⁷

The first draft of the pastoral presents six moral principles drawn from Scripture and the social teachings of the Church:

1. The minimum conditions for life and community. These include not only civil and political rights (freedom of speech, worship, etc.), but also the rights to life, food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care, education and employment.
2. Human dignity can be realized and protected only in community
3. All people have a right to participate in the economic life of society.
4. Every economic decision and institution must be judged in the light of whether it protects or undermines the dignity of the human person. The economy should serve people, not the other way around.

5. Society as a whole, acting through government and private institutions, has the moral responsibility to enhance human dignity and protect human rights.
6. All members of society have a special obligation to the poor and vulnerable. As followers of Christ, we are challenged to make a fundamental option for the poor – to speak for the voiceless and to defend the defenseless.

Part two of the letter in the first draft dealt with five policy issues: 1) unemployment, 2) poverty, 3) planning, 4) trade with developing nations, and 5) food and agriculture.

At the November 1984 meeting only thirteen bishops commented on the first draft. Archbishop Philip Hannan of New Orleans asked for an inclusion of low-cost housing. Cardinal Joseph Bernardin warned against a “laundry list of economic issues,” and Archbishop John O’Connor of New York told of how eager a Wall Street group of financiers was to hear the pastoral and how he was personally going to conduct weekly classes for them. Archbishop Francis Hurley of Anchorage advised his brother bishops to “get to know poor people firsthand. Set an example of personal contact with poor people. Jesus was seen personally and visibly with the poor.”⁸ The bishops did not debate the first draft very much at that meeting, but were instructed to take the letter back to their home dioceses for continued consultation.

The Reagan administration, according to White House spokesperson Larry Speakes, shared the bishops’ concern for the poor expressed in the first draft of the pastoral letter on the economy. While Speakes noted that President Reagan welcomed the draft of the pastoral letter, he observed it would be inappropriate to comment on it, since it would not be in final form for at least another year.⁹

What was noteworthy was the interest by the media at the first press conference after the first draft was released. Ron Krietemeyer remembers it well: “The committee itself was nervous

about this first press conference and I learned from one of the committee members, that the committee's advisers spent 2 ½ hours coaching Archbishop Weakland on questions that might be asked. In point of fact, they anticipated practically all the questions, so the Archbishop was prepared."¹⁰ According to Mr. Kreitermeyer, there were 200 members of the press and 50 television cameras from all over the world covering the press event. The first draft made headlines all over the U.S. and these were followed by editorials in major and minor newspapers. This was indeed a great, teachable moment. The New York Times Magazine in 1983 had an extended article describing the process. What seemed to interest the secular press was that the bishops were asking questions and listening to answers from other than the ecclesiastical and Catholic academic sources.

When the bishops were criticized that they were supposed to be teachers and therefore had no business being taught by others, the bishops' response, as I recall, was a reminder of the Aristotelian principle of pedagogy: "The universal instrument of all good teaching is the question." In asking questions, the bishops were already functioning as teachers.

The most important meeting involving the entire body of U.S. bishops was that held at St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota, in June 1985. It was the first opportunity the bishops had to critique the first draft issued the previous November. Half a day was devoted to dialogue and responses on the initial draft. The bishops met in small groups to express their views. The section on the "preferential option for the poor" was one of the most debated. Also discussed was the implementation of the pastoral. It was the consensus that the draft was exceedingly long and must be shortened.

Bishop Rosazza said that some of the bishops thought the tone was too negative. Bishop Michael of Erie remarked, "The tone of this document reminds me of the *Dies Irae*; I would like

the final version to ring like the finale of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony!"¹¹ The bishops expressed their confidence in the committee as well as their gratitude.

III. THE SECOND DRAFT

After the input from the bishops at Collegeville, the committee in the next few months drafted the second version which was released on October 5, 1985. It affirmed once again that the fundamental criterion for all economic decisions and institutions is that they serve all the people, especially the poor. "Every perspective of economic life that is human, moral, and Christian," says the draft, "must be shaped by three questions – What does the economy do for the people? What does it do to the people? And how do people participate in it?" Using both biblical concepts and ethical norms, the draft set forth moral criteria for assessing economic life and called for a "new American experiment" to enhance human dignity through the determined pursuit of greater economic justice. The document proposed three priorities: 1) fulfilling the basic needs of the poor, 2) increasing participation in economic life by those who are presently excluded or vulnerable, and 3) targeting the investment of wealth, talent and human energy to benefit those who are poor or economically insecure. The second draft selected four issues having to do with policy: 1) employment, 2) poverty, 3) food and agriculture, and 4) economic and international concerns.

IV. THE THIRD DRAFT

The third draft was released on June 2, 1986. This draft called for the sweeping reforms or replacement of the World Bank, the International Monetary fund, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. These institutions were neither "representative nor capable of dealing adequately with current problems." The third draft was critical of what it sees as misguided and insufficient U. S. efforts to encourage development and reduce poverty in the Third World.

V. THE FINAL VOTE

In November 1986 the bishops presented quite a few amendments to the third draft which had been sent to all the bishops a few weeks earlier. There were strong feelings among the bishops about the style and length of the letter. This was partially resolved with the decision to produce a “Pastoral Message” to accompany the complete document. The passage of the pastoral required 195 votes (two-thirds of the *de jure* members attending). On November 13, it was adopted by a vote of 225 to 9. When the results were announced a loud and sustained round of applause was extended to the committee.

VI. IMPACT

Bishop Rosazza says that many people in the business community were threatened by it. “James Tobin said it was economically naïve but he was most pleased that a group such as the America Catholic bishops was speaking out in favor of the poor during the decisions of the Reagan administration. Actually it was because of the controversy with the Reagan policies that our efforts got so much press.”¹²

The letter received favorable reactions at the national and international levels. On December 22, 1986 the pastoral was debated before the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress by a panel that included Archbishop Weakland, Father Bryan Hahir, and Father David Hollenbach and others. Archbishop Weakland referred to the high rate of unemployment in the U.S.: “the fact that so many are poor in a nation as wealthy as ours is a social and moral scandal.” There is, he said, a positive, constructive role for government in the economy of the nation.¹³

Father Hollenbach stressed that the minimum wage has now fallen to 15-20 percent below poverty level. Father Hehir emphasized the pressing need to revamp the global economy

which keeps 800 million people in dire poverty and 500 million who are hungry every day despite an abundance of food.

Their presentation made a significant impact. Representative David Obey (D-Wis.), commented that well over two-thirds of the U.S. foreign aid is provided not on the basis of need but for military purposes.¹⁴

In a January 1987 speech to social justice officials, Owen Bieber, President of the United Auto Workers, endorsed the pastoral as a guide for economic reform. He also declared that the U.S. bishops are confronting the American dream currently perverted by greed with the American reality that demands economic justice.¹⁵

According to Archbishop Weakland the business community did not know how to deal with the letter as they had not been accustomed to reflect on the relationship between a free market economy and the values of society. Economists were also divided and most were hesitant to discuss moral issues. There was also a division among the media; most of those newspapers and periodicals that specialize in economic and business affairs were negative, such as *Forbes*, *Fortune*, and the *Wall Street Journal*. General newspapers were more positive. The Archbishop was disappointed by the lack of strong support from departments of economics in many Catholic universities. For the most part, he says, the strongest support came from secular universities. At Harvard, for example, the pastoral letter became part of the required reading for incoming freshmen.¹⁶

According to Fr. Bryan Hehir, the secular press noted that the pastoral letter gave the discussion on poverty a respectable forum. "It placed the issue on the table." It provided an appropriate system on how to think about poverty and the market economy. What the bishops proposed was not an option for Marxism nor for neo-classic capitalism. They were writing out

of sensitivity to the American experience that tells us that we cannot leave the economy to the market alone. The letter, says Fr. Hehir, places the issue of poverty in the moral context of economics and in particular in a capitalist society.¹⁷

In Archbishop Weakland's viewpoint, European economists were very supportive, as were those from Central and South America. "Europeans, because of the strong influence of Catholic social teaching on the thinking of the leaders of the Christian Democratic parties after World War II (Adenauer, De Gasperi, Schuman, and the like), were very much at home with the values enunciated. They seemed to understand better the basic thrust of Catholic social teaching and thus had a better grasp of what we were about. The letter was translated into Spanish, French, German and Italian. I gave lectures on it in Switzerland, Austria, England, and Italy and found very receptive audiences."¹⁸

For the sake of follow-up the bishops established an Office of Implementation of the pastoral letter. The bishops budgeted \$525,000 over three years. This made it possible for the Conference to hire three full-time individuals. The implementation of the plan began immediately after that November meeting. The economic pastoral enjoyed the most complete implementation plan and resources of any pastoral ever published by the American bishops. Among the results of this office were the "Planning Tool for Diocesan Implementation," a pledge of commitment for economic justice and a summary of the letter in a convenient card format with the ten principles for a just economic life.

Ms. Nancy Wisdo was the liaison between the Office of Social Justice and World Peace and the dioceses during the time of the implementation. She is now Associate Secretary at the USCCB. She told me that the Conference still uses the economic pastoral; the policies that it

proscribed have been in use over the years until the present. Positions that the Conference takes on domestic and international economic policies are based on the economic pastoral.¹⁹

Bill Daly, a staff member at the National Association of Church Personnel Administrators (NACPA), said that the pastoral letter validated NACPA's mission and underscored the organization's credibility with Church leaders. In 1994 NACPA published a position paper, "The Individual and the Institution: Strengthening Working Relationships in the Church," which quotes the economic pastoral. According to Mr. Daly, "Our goal was to make more explicit the concepts expressed in the pastoral about justice in Church workplaces."²⁰

Ten years after the issuance of the pastoral, a new edition was printed together with a pastoral message. The message was entitled: "A Decade after Economic Justice for All: Continuing Principles, Changing Context, New Challenges."

The people in the pews were the most receptive in Archbishop Weakland's viewpoint. "Perhaps this is because we tried our best to touch on the issues that affect their lives, like poverty, unemployment, the disparity of wealth, and the like. The labor unions were, for the most part, supportive, even if they had wished, I believe, a stronger affirmation of what they were trying to do. I often felt they did not accept the distinction we made between the Church's support for collective bargaining as a principle and the actions of any particular union which might not be supported. Although there was a new generation of Catholic who had known nothing about the history of Catholic social teaching and had not been influenced by it, the letter was a stimulus to many to take up that study and that has been positive."²¹

The letter was most useful to those in social ministry. Even today what they mostly quote from the pastoral on the economy is the phrase, "Every perspective on economic life that is

human, moral and Christian, must be shaped by three questions: What does the economy do *for* people? What does it do *to* people? And how do people *participate* in it?”

In my opinion the teaching of the Church on social justice permeates much of our efforts in evangelization and faith formation. Our catechisms and textbooks for the most part include our social teachings. The reason for this is not the U.S. bishops’ pastoral letter on the economy alone. It is due, first of all, to the popes of the twentieth century and the way they kept alive the spirit of the first of the modern encyclicals on social justice, Pope Leo XIII’s *Rerum Novarum*, written in 1891. Practically every pope since then has been strong on social justice.

Another important factor is that the U.S. bishops too have established a tradition that dates back to the origins of what is now the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. During the First World War the bishops were organized as the National Catholic War Council for the sake of assuring that Catholic chaplains were there to serve Catholic soldiers. After the War in 1919 they became the “National Catholic Welfare Conference” (NCWC) which set out to advocate for social legislation and share their vision towards the post-war reconstruction of the country. Of the eleven legislation recommendations, ten became law, including minimum wage, child labor, and social insurance laws. Over many years U.S. bishops have written on war and peace, racism, immigration, welfare, education, health, agriculture and other social concerns.

Our generation of bishops witnessed the heroic stands taken by the Latin American bishops at their general assemblies held at Medellín, Colombia in 1968, at Puebla, Mexico in 1987, and at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic in 1992. The martyrdom of Archbishop Arnulfo Romero, the assassination of the American religious women and of the Jesuits at the Universidad de Centroamérica (UCA) in El Salvador had a lasting impact on the American bishops’ thinking and teaching in the last several decades.

The non-judgmental style of the letter is similar to that in *Centesimus Annus*, the encyclical of Pope John Paul II, issued May 1, 1991, a few years after the U.S. bishops' letter on the economy. The encyclical provides a careful analysis of the downfall of Marxism. It deplors the failed and empty promises of communism while he warns against a capitalism which neglects the human and moral dimensions of economic life.

The Pope contends that without a strong ethical and cultural underpinning, the social fabric is weakened, and the production of goods and services alone become paramount.

Centesimus Annus and the bishops' pastoral say basically, and I simplify, "The market can do good things; the market by itself cannot do everything and the market must be supplemented..." Neither are hostile to the market economy.

Some critics said that the Pope's encyclical was a repudiation of what the bishops wrote. In point of fact they coincide on many points, such as the dignity of work, the rights of workers, the role of unions, their analyses of the market economy, the responsibility of the state, the option for the poor, concern over the international debt and consumerism and ecology.

While they have different authors and different purposes, they draw on the same sources and deliver a consistent message – economic life must reflect moral values, respect the dignity of the human person, and serve the common good.

VII. NEW SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Were we to write the pastoral letter again, we would simply restate the first part of the letter. It is a long and thorough presentation of the biblical and natural law principles on which the social teachings of the Church are based. These would not change. What would change would be the application of those principles in the second part of the letter, because the world has changed over the past twenty years. The pastoral letter does not mention globalization nor the

internet. We would have to explain how these new realities have shaped the economy in the United States and globally. (Actually the concept of globalization could be interpreted in the letter's use of the word *interdependence*.)

Domestic

We would address domestic issues having to do with the on-going poverty situation. The reports we hear from Washington is that the economy is growing and that joblessness is down. The fact is that the present economy is not producing jobs with livable wages. In this respect, we are worse off than in the 1980's. Wages are so low that we now refer to a great segment of our population as the "working poor."²²

We would address the retreat of our government's responsibility to provide a safety net. The poor are being hit hard with cut backs on child and health care. We are not meeting the needs for affordable housing. More than one half of Americans can expect to live in poverty at some time in their lives. The middle class is no longer secure. Now it takes more than a high school diploma in order to have economic stability, yet we continue to have a shockingly high rate of drop outs from our schools.

We would have to shed light on the current debate on immigration reform.

In light of the Enron and WorldCom scandals, we would make a strong plea for ethics in the business world.

We would update the section in the pastoral on food and agriculture in the context of world trade.

Global

We would bring up the issue of the Third World debt.

We would address the growing concern for the environment and ecology. We would contribute to the debate on global warming.

Archbishop Weakland says that were we to do a new pastoral on the economy we would have to analyze the relationship between wealth and power. “This plays itself out very clearly in a global economy where some nations are weaker than some of the global business corporations.” He also would include the role of government in the economy. The trade problems between the European market and the U.S., he goes on to say, usually revolves around government subsidies that then interfere with a free market.²³

It would be good for us to look at the question of energy sources. It is generally agreed that we must cut back on our dependence on fossil fuels and take on the challenge of finding new sources of energy. We would have to say something about how the energy crisis, especially high prices for gas and oil are affecting the poor. In our area I heard that some people are pawning some of their valuables in order to pay for gasoline.

We would look at the impact of our highly consumeristic society on people’s values, on their concept of success, on their relationship to others – family, friendships, community, government, as well as on the environment..

We would be compelled to look to Latin America where poverty is still tragically prevalent. We would do well to examine our government’s policies towards that region over the past several decades. During the Cold War, and especially after the Cuban missile crisis, we were obsessed with the possibility that Latin America would go communist. There were even military incursions in Nicaragua, Haiti, Panama, Dominican Republic and Grenada. With the ending of the Cold War our attention has turned towards the Middle East, certainly because of our energy needs. Recently in countries such as Venezuela and Bolivia, there is a turning away

from the influence of U.S. capitalism. Not that these countries want to go communist, they simply want to distance themselves from any kind of dependence. They desire to create their own way of doing things and make new friends such as with Cuba and China.

In addition to this catalogue of needs and present-day problems, I think we would point out the good news in the present-day economy. Good news is that much of our younger generation is challenging and offering strong criticism of the way we have dealt and are dealing with environmental issues. Another source of good news, in my opinion, are the new immigrants, whether they enter our country legally or illegally, they come with a very strong work ethic, family values and deep faith. They arrive here with a strong motivation to educate their children. Their children will be future leaders in our society and if their parents are successful in handing on Christian and gospel values they will contribute to a more just society.

I also see good news in what the U.S. bishops do with the Catholic Campaign for Human Development, with its emphasis on helping people to help themselves through viable organizations. We are justly proud of Catholic Charities which is the greatest provider for the needs of the poor, next to the government. There are, throughout the country, effective community organizations such as those connected with the Industrial Areas Foundation, the Midwest Academy, ACORN, and Pacific Institute for Community Organizations (PICO).

Our Catholic Relief Services is one of the largest non-governmental organizations to assist in disasters throughout the world. It is also impressive that our American people can be so generous when there is a call to help those affected by natural catastrophes.

After the final draft was approved Commonweal magazine applauded the bishops for delivering the Good News. “But the Good News is always difficult to hear. For one thing, it is too good to believe, for another, it is too good to live up to.”²⁴

Despite the enormous problems involved nationally and internationally, a constant strong optimism characterizes the pastoral: “We believe that with your prayers, reflection, service and action, our economy can be shaped so that human dignity prospers and the human person is served. This is the unfinished work of our nation. This is the challenge of our faith.”²⁵

¹ Interview with Archbishop Rembert Weakland, OSB, March 30, 2006.

² Telephone interview with Mr. Ron Kreitermeyer, May, 2006.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Nolan, Hugh J., Editor, Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Vol. V, 1983-1988, U.S. Catholic Conference, 1989, p. 274.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Weakland interview, March 30, 2006.

⁷ Washington Post Editorial, “The Bishops and the Economy,” November 13, 1984, p. A14.

⁸ Nolan, Hugh J. Ed., Vol. V, p. 276.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Kreitermeyer interview, May, 2006.

¹¹ Interview with Bishop Peter A. Rosazza, March 30, 2006.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Nolan, Hugh J., Ed., Vol. V, p. 285-286.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 286.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 286.

¹⁶ Weakland interview, March 30, 2006.

¹⁷ Telephone interview with Rev. J. Bryan Hehir, May, 2006.

¹⁸ Weakland interview, March 30, 2006.

¹⁹ Telephone interview with Ms. Nancy Wisdo, May, 2006.

²⁰ Telephone interview with Mr. Bill Daly, May 2006.

²¹ Ibid.

²² “Poverty USA”, www.usccb.org/cchd/povertyusa/povfact2.shtml.

²³ Weakland interview, March 30, 2006.

²⁴ Nolan, Hugh J., Ed., p. 287.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 378.