

REFORMATION: MONSIGNOR CHARLES
OWEN RICE AND THE FRAGMENTATION
OF THE NEW DEAL ELECTORAL
COALITION IN PITTSBURGH,
1960-1972

Kenneth J. Heineman
Ohio University-Lancaster

The tearing apart of the New Deal electoral coalition in the 1960s has attracted growing scholarly and media attention. Gregory Schneider and Rebecca Klatch emphasized the role collegiate libertarians played in moving youths to the Right. Rick Perlstein, focusing on conservatives who came of age during World War II, argued that the New Right wedded southern white racism to midwestern conspiracy-obsessed anti-Communism. For his part, Dan Carter contended that Alabama governor George Wallace's racist politics migrated north where they found a receptive audience in urban Catholics.¹

Samuel Freedman chronicled the ideological evolution of several generations of northern Catholics as they moved into the GOP in reaction to black protest, mounting urban crime, and the Vietnam War. Ronald Formisano, Jonathan Rieder, and Thomas Sugrue, in their studies of Boston, New York, and Detroit, respectively, gave less attention to the Vietnam War, emphasizing the racial attitudes of working-class Catholics and unionists. In

their surveys of the relationship between Catholics and blacks, John McGreevy and Gerald Gamm argued that urban Catholics frequently did not respond well to blacks.²

Ronald Radosh and Steven Gillon took a different tack from Carter, Gamm, and Sugrue. In their studies of the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), an organization that anti-Communist Democrats such as Minneapolis mayor Hubert Humphrey had helped create in 1947, Radosh and Gillon examined the middle-class activists who rejected America's anti-Communist foreign policy and the racial conservatism of many unionists. While anti-Communist Democrats often ignored their foes on the Right, the challenge presented by the ADA's "progressive" faction was far greater since it came from within and contained the seeds of bitter division.³

Students of twentieth-century American politics agree that the fatal weakness of the New Deal electoral coalition had been evident since its inception in the 1930s. Franklin Roosevelt bequeathed to his successors a majority made up of minorities who were united by the economic crisis of the Depression and potentially divided by social issues and foreign policy. Democrats could not afford defections since most northern white Protestants were Republican.

In the key industrial states such as Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Pennsylvania that helped to determine presidential elections, Democrats picked up relatively few votes outside black, Catholic, Jewish, and unionized urban counties. This political fact of life meant that in Pennsylvania, since the GOP remained competitive even during the Depression, Democrats had to carry Philadelphia County by a margin of 60 percent and not slip below 55 percent in Allegheny County (Pittsburgh) to win gubernatorial and senate races, as well as the third largest pot of presidential electoral votes.

By the 1960s Catholics accounted for one-third of all Democratic voters and were the backbone of the unions that filled the campaign coffers of the party of Roosevelt. In Pennsylvania, 31 percent of the population was Catholic and 37 percent belonged to a union. The United Steel Workers of America (USWA) alone claimed 270,000 Pennsylvania members, most of which lived in the Pittsburgh region. GOP strategist Kevin Phillips regarded Catholics as a key-voting bloc. Pursuing an anti-civil rights "southern strategy" in hopes of bringing Dixie's white Protestants into the GOP would make Republicans nationally competitive. Securing the allegiance of Catholics would make Republicans dominant.⁴

Certainly the social trends of the 1960s raised the possibility of what became known in academic and media circles as an ethnic—meaning

working-class Catholic—backlash against the Democratic party. Violent crime increased 126 percent nationally; the rate in Allegheny County climbed 129 percent, a full 24 percentage points higher than the more populous Philadelphia County. By 1970, researchers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology concluded that U.S. soldiers in World War II had been less likely to be killed in combat than urban residents going about their business.⁵

From all appearances in the early 1960s, however, Pittsburgh did not seem a likely locale for an anti-Democratic backlash. In a city of over 600,000 people—the tenth largest urban center in the U.S.—no Republican had been elected to the council or the mayor's office since 1932. Eighty percent of the city's registered voters were Democrats. During the Depression, priests such as Charles Owen Rice, with the support of Bishop Hugh Boyle, had placed the moral authority of the Catholic Church behind the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO). Catholic churches even served as organizing bases for the steel workers' union.

To counteract employers' claims that the steel workers' union was Communist-inspired, Rice barnstormed the industrial heartland and took to the radio to persuade wary Catholics that the CIO was Christian and American. He also chastised Detroit's anti-CIO and anti-Semitic "radio priest," Charles Coughlin, and castigated the House Committee on Un-American Activities for smearing the good names of devout Catholic unionists. As social commentator Richard Krickus argued, Rice and the other "labor priests" of the 1930s made working-class Catholics comfortable with the CIO, created an alternative model of political mobilization that was based on religious, not Marxist, principles of justice, and protected unions from conservatives who used anti-Communism as a pretext for opposing better wages and hours.⁶

Philip Murray, the first president of what became the USWA, as well as John L. Lewis's successor as leader of the CIO, attended Mass daily and was a close friend of Rice. Murray kept reference copies at his desk of the papal encyclicals of Leo XIII (*The Condition of Labor*, 1891) and Pius XI (*After Forty Years*, 1931) on social justice and the rights of laborers. Both Murray and Rice admired Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement she founded in New York during the Depression. Although they embraced Day's commitment to social activism, they rejected her unconditional pacifism. Indeed, it was Rice who led Murray to become the first and only major Irish Catholic union leader to support military aid to Britain prior to U.S. entry into World War II.⁷

David Lawrence, who became mayor of Pittsburgh and the first Catholic governor of Pennsylvania, built a Democratic organization unlike those of Boston and New York. In Pittsburgh, as would be true throughout the industrial heartland as political scientist Steven Erie observed, Irish leaders forged a multi-ethnic coalition. With the support of unions and clerical and lay activists, Catholics, Jews, and blacks had a place at the table. As mayor, Lawrence drew national attention for working with the Mellons and other corporate titans to reduce air pollution and revitalize the downtown. He also directed the city council in 1953 to pass a fair-employment-practices ordinance. *Time* and other major media recognized Lawrence as the most powerful and politically influential mayor in America.⁸

In Pittsburgh, the Democratic party, the steel workers' union, and the Catholic Church became an "Iron City Trinity," rising in tandem thanks to Lawrence, Murray, and Rice. When conservative Republicans in 1964, working on behalf of Arizona senator Barry Goldwater's presidential campaign, tried to exploit friction between the Democratic voters of Pittsburgh's Polish Hill and the black Hill District, Catholics—as was true nationally—remained loyal to the party of Roosevelt. Most working-class Catholics had no use for Goldwater's Western Pennsylvania champions, especially publisher Richard Scaife, a libertarian and anti-union activist. However, as it soon became evident, few Catholics had any use for Democratic civil rights and antiwar activists either. To the chagrin of anti-Communist Catholics, one of the reform leaders whom they came to loathe was their own Charles Owen Rice.⁹

As a result of training half of the region's union leaders in the Catholic "labor schools" he founded and fighting Communist CIO organizers, *Time* and *Fortune* had dubbed Rice one of the nation's most prominent labor priests. Journalists Victor Riesel and Aaron Levenstein reported that Rice had won "a permanent place in the hearts of Pittsburgh unionists." Less glowing, historian David Caute called Pittsburgh "the violent epicenter of the anti-Communist eruption in post-war America," placing Rice in the thick of that "eruption." In truth, Rice did champion the Cold War within the ranks of labor and the Americans for Democratic Action. However, he never called for the persecution of Communists, always seeing them as sincere, misguided idealists who needed to debate their ideas in public. What troubled him most was that Communist labor leaders denied their political affiliations and were not open about their agenda. Such dishonestly and clandestine activity opened organized labor to conservative charges that unions were subversive.¹⁰

The rise of Republican senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin disturbed Rice. As Rice informed the anti-Communist *Brooklyn Tablet* in 1954, McCarthy “is unfair, he is uncharitable, and he helps Communism more than he hurts it.” When Willmore Kendall, who had been William F. Buckley, Jr.’s, mentor at Yale University, identified Catholicism with McCarthy, Rice responded that, “There is no connection between McCarthy and the Catholic Church, but a lot of punch drunk Catholics have sided with him.” Although McCarthy quickly burned out, Rice came away from the 1950s fearful that domestic anti-Communism had gone too far.¹¹

By the beginning of the 1960s, Rice began to wonder if America’s anti-Communist foreign policy was not paranoid McCarthyism exported overseas. He questioned whether Cuban dictator Fidel Castro and North Vietnamese leader Ho Chi Minh were really Communists subservient to Moscow, or Marxist-nationalists seeking self-determination for their people. Rice also expressed sorrow that South Vietnamese president Ngo Dinh Diem, a Catholic, had been persecuting Buddhists.¹²

In 1963, Rice endorsed a test ban on nuclear weapons and rejected the “better red than dead” coda of the American and Soviet arms race:

Worldwide Communist hegemony would not be so bad as an all out nuclear conflict between the big powers. I do not want Communism to prevail and I believe that we should resist it sensibly and should remain alert, but we should seek a way to live with it, competing with it peacefully and honorably. Communist triumph would not mean the end of the world, but nuclear warfare might. As a Christian I firmly believe that Christianity would survive a Communist total victory and after a long night of suffering would transmute Communism.¹³

Rice, who was steadily becoming convinced that the Cold War could not pass muster as a “just” cause given U.S. support for corrupt dictatorships overseas, also grew critical of working-class Catholics whom he felt were more concerned about crime than racial discrimination. In 1964, Rice wrote that “racism lies beneath most white American skins.” As a consequence of racism, the “anti-social slum Negro” had “been socially damaged.” After President Lyndon Johnson sent U.S. combat forces to South Vietnam in 1965, Rice began to associate Catholic and union support for the escalating Indochinese War with what he saw as their opposition to racial equality. Eventually, in reaction to the bloodshed in Vietnam and the growing social disorder at home,

Rice came to believe that “dogmatic anti-Communism is a major American sickness” and to lament that, “we, who once, as a nation, spread freedom and hope, are now spreading guns, war, and suppression of freedom.”¹⁴

Many Western Pennsylvania Catholics would be shocked at Rice’s apparent ideological transformation. They did not appreciate that his anti-Communism had always been qualified, did not understand that he viewed Nazi Germany and Communist North Vietnam as two wildly different countries—with the latter representing no threat to America’s security—and, finally, did not recognize that racial discrimination, which Catholic unionists had largely placed on the backburner in the 1930s, could no longer be ignored with the birth of the southern civil rights movement and the growth of the northern urban black population. It was not so much that Rice and working-class Catholics changed; the times changed, exposing differences that had always been there but had not been as pressing.

The journey that led to Rice being quoted by Radio Hanoi and becoming co-chair of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, serving alongside David Dellinger and Martin Luther King, Jr., was a long one. Bishop Jean Dearden had exiled Rice to Washington County in the early 1950s. Pittsburgh’s labor priest claimed that Dearden was punishing him for having implied that New York’s Francis Cardinal Spellman was a strike-breaking “scab.” When John Wright replaced Dearden as bishop in 1959, Rice felt that his fortunes had improved. Activist that he was, Rice still deferred to Church authority and would not make waves without the approval of his bishop.¹⁵

Pittsburgh had never seen a bishop like Wright. Where Dearden had been a nuts and bolts administrator and Hugh Boyle had been a crusading son of the Pennsylvania working class, Wright was a Boston intellectual, much-published author, Kennedy family confidant, and product of a white-collar family. In Rice, Wright had found a kindred spirit. Both clerics admired Pope John XXIII and championed the dramatic reforms within the Catholic Church that became known as “Vatican II.” Two of John XXIII’s encyclicals, *Mother and Teacher* (1961) and *Peace on Earth* (1963), guided Wright and Rice in their civil rights and antiwar activism. Wright encouraged Rice to joust with *National Review* editor William F. Buckley, Jr., and “our ultra-conservative friends” within the Catholic Church. Bishop Wright also gave some cover to Rice’s antiwar activism by co-chairing the National Interreligious Conference on Peace that spoke forcibly against the bombing of North Vietnam.¹⁶

Wright asked Rice to resume his column for the diocesan newspaper, the *Pittsburgh Catholic* and paved the way for his elevation to Monsignor. In 1966, the bishop brought Rice back to Pittsburgh in style, sponsoring a reception that included former Governor David Lawrence, Pittsburgh's Catholic mayor, Joseph Barr, and 500 other government and labor representatives. Wright then installed Rice in Holy Rosary Parish in Homewood. Holy Rosary's membership had peaked in the 1940s with 2,600 families. Confronted with a growing black Protestant population and a diminishing number of Catholics under the age of eighteen, however, the pastor, Monsignor Henry Carlin, closed the parish high school in 1947. With the influx of people displaced by urban renewal in the Hill District, Homewood between 1950 and 1960 went from 78 percent white to 66 percent black. In 1966, Holy Rosary had just 479 white and 200 black families.¹⁷

Operating from Holy Rosary, Rice, who walked picket lines and took to the radio to defend the CIO in the 1930s, became the "ghetto priest" of the 1960s. Rice sought out black community leaders such as Bouie Haden whom he saw as worthy heirs to the Catholic labor leaders of the 1930s. The Pittsburgh Police Department, however, thought otherwise, identifying Haden as a convicted felon whose followers stoked the flames of the city's 1968 riot that followed the assassination of King.¹⁸

Aldo Colautti, the Executive Secretary to Mayor Barr and a Catholic son of Pittsburgh, held Rice's ghetto allies and those in "university circles" responsible for the riot, which resulted in 926 arrests and the injury of thirty-three firemen and twelve police officers. Confronted after the riot by activist Catholics complaining that the police were over-reacting to rising crime rates, Barr rose from his desk, angrily pointed his finger at Father Donald McIlvane—a protégé of Rice—and vowed, "We're going to have law and order in this city and anybody who doesn't agree is not a good citizen."¹⁹

Bishop Wright's Human Relations Commission blamed the 1968 riot on racist whites and police officers that engaged in "counter-insurgency" tactics as if they were shooting Vietnamese peasants. The local media soon revealed that Wright had given Bouie Haden a \$12,000 grant. Rice did not deny that the black militants were using Church funds to purchase guns and ammunition. Outraged Catholics descended upon St. Paul Cathedral and hung Wright in effigy. Contributions to the Bishop's Fund fell dramatically, prompting Rice to denounce the "right-wing nuts" who were intent upon damaging the Catholic Church.²⁰

While Catholics were not ready to lynch the bishop, neither were they enlisting in Rice and Wright's civil rights crusade. According to a 1964 municipal survey of Pittsburgh's racial attitudes, Catholics were demonstrating "resentment toward Negro families moving into their neighborhood." (Jews who belonged to Conservative temples and white and *black* Protestants also expressed disdain for underclass neighbors.)²¹

In a diocese of 915,000, just 459 lay members belonged to the Pittsburgh chapter of the Catholic Interracial Council (CIC), even though Wright emphasized "the urgency of the racial question, particularly in terms of religion" and at a 1966 Labor Day Mass exhorted union members to wage a "conscience crusade" on behalf of civil rights. Founded in 1956, the Pittsburgh CIC was, demographically speaking, a peculiar organization. In terms of ethnicity, 85 percent of its lay members in 1965 hailed from Irish and German families, whereas the composition of the Pittsburgh Diocese was roughly 60 percent eastern and southern European. When the CIC in 1967 sent out 100 letters inviting members of ethnic fraternal organizations to participate in a George Washington Carver luncheon, no Italian or Slovak organizations responded, though two Polish groups did send representatives.²²

There was no little irony that an organization led by two priests with ghetto parishes—Rice and McIlvane—and devoted to the problems of the inner city had a majority (53 percent) suburban membership. Another 5 percent lived in outlying, nearly all-white, towns, while 14 percent resided in Pittsburgh's three most prosperous white neighborhoods (Shadyside, Squirrel Hill, and Highland Park). Thirteen percent resided in the black neighborhoods of the Hill District, Homewood-Brushton, and Manchester. The remaining 15 percent lived in Pittsburgh's other, less affluent white neighborhoods.²³

CIC members believed that by visiting blacks in their homes and sponsoring lectures on civil rights they could erase racial barriers. A more militant group of Catholic laity and clergy, however, scorned home visits and lectures. In 1966, CIC activists accused the Pittsburgh Knights of Columbus of excluding blacks, criticized Wright for assigning three priests to Polish Hill's Immaculate Heart of Mary Parish while neglecting Hill District Catholics, and demanded that black Protestants be given diocesan scholarships and admitted to Polish Hill's parochial schools. After 1969, when the CIC filed a complaint with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare charging that Pittsburgh's parochial schools practiced deliberate racial segregation, half its membership abandoned the group.²⁴

Lacking the support of working-class urban Catholics for his civil rights and antiwar activism, Rice sought new allies. In analyzing the membership of several organizations that Rice helped lead, including the ADA, the Ad Hoc Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and the Pittsburgh Peace and Freedom Center, a few observations are in order. Presbyterian and Episcopalian clergy were ubiquitous, Catholic priests and nuns scarce. Just six CIC members joined the Ad Hoc Committee in 1965: three priests, two professors at Duquesne University—Pittsburgh's major Catholic institution of higher education—and the editor of the *Pittsburgh Catholic*. Rice's own brother, Father Patrick Rice, and his close ally in the labor struggles of the 1930s, Father Carl Hensler, declined to move from the civil rights activism of the CIC to the antiwar organizing of the Ad Hoc Committee.²⁵

The Rodef Shalom Temple, its congregation famous for having championed the 1885 Pittsburgh Platform that gave birth to Reform Judaism, functioned as an activist center, as did the Irene Kaufmann Jewish Community Center. A cautious surname analysis suggests that Jews, who accounted for 8 percent of the region's population, were over-represented in ADA (46 percent), the Ad Hoc Committee (21 percent), the Peace and Freedom Center (27 percent), and the 7/11 Democratic Club (19 percent), a ward-based reform organization. The high proportion of Jews within the ADA was not surprising given that two of the founders of the Pittsburgh chapter were Jewish: Alexander Lowenthal and the wife of his business partner, Florence Reizenstein. In the 1940s and 1950s Lowenthal, Reizenstein, and Rice worked together on public housing issues and lobbied Mayor Lawrence to promote civil rights.²⁶

Rice broke with a number of New Deal-era Jewish politicians in the 1960s, notably congressman, judge, and David Lawrence-confidant Henry Ellenbogen. In the 1930s Pittsburgh's Jewish Democratic leaders had been members of Conservative temples, champions of the CIO, foes of Marxism, and, invariably, graduates of Duquesne. Thirty years later, Jewish activists in the antiwar movement hailed from socially liberal Reform temples. They were also more likely products of Yale, not Duquesne, and rejected judges such as Ellenbogen whom they argued set bail too high for antiwar demonstrators and criminal defendants.²⁷

Most activists were white-collar professionals connected to the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Tech (later Carnegie Mellon University), or "housewives," lawyers, teachers, and social workers employed by foundations and the public sector. (The Ad Hoc Committee, however, did count the

president of the largest advertising agency in Western Pennsylvania in its ranks.) Among the members of the 7/11 Club were the directors of the Irene Kaufmann Jewish Community Center and Point Park College, as well as a liberal arts dean, a Pennsylvania Supreme Court law clerk, and the producer of WQED, Pittsburgh's public television station. There were few private sector-employed engineers, researchers, and scientists, and still fewer blue-collar members. Activist housewives were married to professionals, not steel workers.²⁸

Residentially, activists clustered in Point Breeze, the University District of Oakland, and three city wards: the 7th (Shadyside), the 11th (Highland Park/East Liberty), and the 14th (Squirrel Hill). In the 1930s, wards 7, 11, and 14—excluding East Liberty—had been Pittsburgh's most affluent, Republican, and anti-union. By the 1960s, as Protestant steel managers migrated to the suburbs and were replaced by public-sector employed professionals, these wards were the city's most affluent, socially liberal, and hostile toward unions that supported the Vietnam War and opposed racial hiring quotas.²⁹

Three of Pittsburgh's key activists were leading figures in the liberal wing of the Western Pennsylvania Republican party: billionaire Henry Hillman, his wife Elsie—an abortion rights advocate and Allegheny County GOP chair in 1967—and attorney Richard Thornburgh. Prior to becoming a U.S. Attorney in 1969, Thornburgh spoke against the Vietnam War, chastised Goldwater for conducting a presidential campaign "that clearly exhibited some racist feelings," and served on the Pittsburgh board of directors of the Urban League, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and the Neighborhood Legal Services Association. In 1968, Thornburgh clashed with Robert Duggan, the Republican law-and-order District Attorney of Allegheny County who had dismissed the Neighborhood Legal Services Association and the ACLU as havens for criminal "parasites on public welfare."³⁰

The three most important allies Rice made in 1960s Pittsburgh underlined the distance he traveled from his working-class Catholic base. First there was James Cunningham, an urban affairs expert who had come to Pittsburgh in the 1950s to assist the city in constructing decent housing for low-income families. Cunningham had been a Chicago stalwart of the Independent Voters of Illinois—a Gold Coast organization of professionals who wanted to oust Richard Daley and what they believed was a racist Catholic political machine from public office.³¹

In Pittsburgh, Cunningham organized antiwar protests and, through the ADA and the 7/11 Club he founded, tried to move the Democratic party to the left. Cunningham, a member of the CIC, criticized co-religionists who “resist change” and dismissed the “fantasy” of black crime. He ultimately quit city employment for a professorship at the University of Pittsburgh.³²

Rice’s other two key allies were Molly Yard, the future president of the National Organization for Women and Depression-era student activist at Swarthmore College, and state legislator Gerald Kaufman, a graduate of Yale and the Columbia University School of Law. Yard and Rice co-chaired the Western Pennsylvania ADA. Both lobbied the Democratic party and the AFL-CIO to repudiate America’s Cold War foreign policy. Kaufman, who joined Yard and Rice on the ADA board, established the activist 14th Ward Democratic Club, served as the Pennsylvania coordinator of George McGovern’s 1972 presidential campaign, and sponsored legislation to legalize abortion. He also opposed federal initiatives requiring male welfare recipients to seek employment: “Why can’t a man just stay at home and live—if that’s what he wants to do?”³³

In 1968, when Rice, Yard, and Kaufman embraced Eugene McCarthy—Minnesota’s antiwar senator—and said that they were “repulsed” by Democratic presidential candidate Hubert Humphrey, the United Steel Workers of America cut off its subsidies to the ADA. (Humphrey carried Allegheny County and Pennsylvania while Democratic senator Joseph Clark, a critic of the war and an ADA star, captured just 48 percent of the county’s vote, offsetting his 61 percent vote share in Philadelphia County and sealing his defeat.) Rice praised the “ADA young rebels” for breaking with organized labor and hoped that they would “achieve a popular base or, at the very least, solidify the intellectual community and the black militants.” That same year, as Rice recounted to a friend, he had been scheduled to address the executive board of a steel workers’ local on Pittsburgh’s ethnic Polish South Side. “When I arrived,” Rice wrote, “some fat ethnic type told me that the board would not see me.”³⁴

Just one union of any significant size, the United Electrical Workers (UE), joined Rice in the antiwar movement. Ironically, Rice had assisted in the purging of the Communist-led UE from the CIO shortly after World War II, prompting an old and unforgiving Marxist foe to write, “Prick your own conscience, Father, for that pastiche of fascism which might lie just below the surface.” In 1967, through the Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy, Rice worked with the 523 national trade union leaders who belonged to the Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace.³⁵

The AFL-CIO Executive Council remained adamant in its support for the Vietnam War. In 1967, 1,368 union representatives urged Johnson to escalate the war, compared to 276 who wanted an immediate withdrawal. One AFL-CIO vice president in 1970 rendered his judgment on antiwar youths and the leftist Students for a Democratic Society (SDS):

They burn books, loot stores, tear apart institutions of learning; they physically assault educators, public officials, and others who disagree—all in the name of destroying the establishment and gaining “freedom” . . . Most of them never did a day’s work, let alone know a day’s suffering, and are still amply cared for by their parents.³⁶

Rice’s response to such attacks was to praise SDS members as “the brightest and most idealistic that we have” among the nation’s youth and to scorn AFL-CIO president George Meany as a “ridiculous hawk” and embarrassment to the Catholic faith. As for Walter Reuther, the president of the United Automobile Workers’ union, Rice expressed his disappointment that he had not been more vigorous in his condemnation of American foreign policy. Shortly after Reuther’s death in 1970, Rice wrote in the *National Catholic Reporter* that the union leader had “clawed his way to the presidency of the United Automobile Workers over the carcasses of Communists and those who were willing to live with Communists.”³⁷

As a University of Michigan study reported, working-class Catholics and union members regarded peace activists as unpatriotic hedonists, even while harboring their own doubts about the conduct of the war. While Rice occasionally conceded the less savory aspects of the New Left, most of his associates could not empathize with the mindset of working-class people. Surveying municipal politics and social activists in 1960s-America, political scientists Raymond Wolfinger and John Field made an observation that could readily apply to Pittsburgh:

From the vantage point of Hyde Park or Harvard Square, almost everyone not connected with the university is an ethnic . . . Much of the opposition to [the way politics operates at the local level] comes from people connected with or attracted to universities, that is, mostly from Jews and Protestants. College faculties and their social satellites are scarcely typical of the Protestant middle class.³⁸

The mental disconnect Wolfinger and Field observed was apparent within the Pittsburgh Left. During the 1967 Vietnam Summer Project organized by the National Mobilization Committee, volunteers went into the community with the antiwar message. Internal memorandums from the Pittsburgh office and national headquarters advised volunteers not to approach people who lived in well-kept homes in blue-collar neighborhoods. Such people “were more likely to support the war.” Instead, volunteers were advised to target blacks living in public housing projects. Topics of discussion could include police-sponsored “genocide” against blacks and how the escalating war might threaten federal welfare expenditures.³⁹

Another example from the fall of 1967 is just as telling. When a delegation arrived from Hiroshima with a “peace torch” to be carried through Pittsburgh, their route passed through black, university, White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP), and Jewish districts. Though Rice was among the organizers of the peace torch protest, Catholic neighborhoods were skirted or avoided altogether. Since there had not been a single incident of violence directed against the city’s peace activists, safety was not an issue. More likely, the Left, paradoxically copying what Goldwater had done in 1964, opted “to hunt where the ducks are.” Such a strategy made some sense given the cultural contours of public opinion. In the Jewish population at large in 1967, 48 percent opposed the war—nearly double the proportion of Catholics. Nationally, 60 percent of New Left student activists had been raised Jewish. Thirty-five percent of student activists were WASPs and just 5 percent Catholic.⁴⁰

Even under the best of circumstances Rice would have found antiwar organizing among blue-collar Catholics difficult. Given that Catholics were 24 percent of the overall U.S. population, but 30 *percent* of the soldiers killed in Vietnam, criticism of the war was bound to be taken personally. (This 6 percent discrepancy represents, in fact, a 25 percent margin of group overrepresentation.) While blacks in 1965 had accounted for one-quarter of the U.S. soldiers in Vietnam, the Defense Department, fearing charges of racism, steadily cut their proportion. Consequently, journalist Michael Lind later concluded, “the only American group that was over-represented in the U.S. armed forces during the [entire] Vietnam War was Catholics.”⁴¹

In the Western Pennsylvania mill town of McKeesport, with a population of 40,000, 23 working-class youths died in Vietnam. (Nationally, 80 percent of America’s Vietnam soldiers came from working-class families.) McKeesport erected the nation’s first “Vietnam Wall” in 1966 and began inscribing the

names of its dead. The steel town of Clairton, just miles away, was the fictional setting for the 1978 Vietnam film, *The Deer Hunter*. (In *The Deer Hunter*, the steel workers were Russian Orthodox, not Roman Catholic. When it came to “Proudly Serving God and Country,” however, there were no differences between the two religious groups.)⁴²

Within the Catholic Church hierarchy, and among notable lay figures, there was little sympathy for antiwar activism. Even fewer accepted Rice’s contention that there was a moral equivalency between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in their exploitation of oppressed people. In 1967, Rice dismissed most Catholic bishops as “unsophisticated and non-intellectual.” He especially loathed Cardinal Spellman of New York for his “clerical militarism.”⁴³

When pacifists established Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (CALCAV), its 12,000 members were almost entirely Reform Jews, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians from the Boston-New York-Philadelphia corridor. There were so few Catholic clergy involved that CALCAV founder Daniel Berrigan was guaranteed to receive disproportionate media attention. CALCAV also featured Berrigan and Rice at antiwar rallies precisely because the Catholic Church was so well known for its anti-Communism. (At an April 1967 rally in New York City attended by 200,000 people, organizers positioned Rice so that he would be photographed linking arms with CALCAV leader Martin Luther King, Jr.)⁴⁴

National Review editor William F. Buckley, Jr., could not bring himself to address Rice by name, contemptuously referring to him as “an old Irish Monsignor from Pittsburgh.” For his part, Joseph O’Meara, the dean of the Notre Dame Law School, contended that “the objectors are either Communists or cowards, or they are persons of large good will but little insight who have been euchred into being stooges, or persons who are seeking some end of their own (ambition, revenge, whatever) at the expense of their country.” Closer to home, Father Walter Karaveckas of St. Casimir’s in Pittsburgh’s South Side neighborhood, informed Rice in 1967 that, “It is a disgrace to find a priest here almost defending Communism.” On the other hand, James Andrews, the managing editor of *Ave Maria* magazine—published by the Holy Cross Fathers of Notre Dame—praised Rice for taking on pro-war Catholic clergy and laity.⁴⁵

Bishop Fulton Sheen of Rochester, New York, was a rare church leader who, in 1967, called for an immediate end to the Vietnam War. (This represented an important change for Sheen who, speaking in Saigon in 1950, had

scourged Vietnamese Communists “supplied with Russian guns.”) Having clashed with Sheen in the 1930s over the extent of Communist infiltration of the steel workers’ union, Rice took some comfort. As he wrote to Thomas Cornell of the Catholic Peace Fellowship in New York, “I am amazed and delighted at Bishop Sheen. He is a greater man than I ever thought.”⁴⁶

Initially, Rice had received a respectful, though disapproving, hearing at local antiwar rallies. At one 1966 rally in downtown Pittsburgh he was the only speaker not booed and interrupted by choruses of the Marine Corps anthem. Then again, Rice simply lamented “hatred” in the world, while the president of the University of Pittsburgh SDS charged that U.S. soldiers were murdering Vietnamese women and children. Rice’s efforts from 1967 onward to assist student draft resisters, however, marked a shift in public opinion toward him. After Rice urged massive draft resistance and participated in the October 1967 march on the Pentagon—“a place in which evil lurks,” he claimed—the editors of a small Western Pennsylvania newspaper chastised him:

This is a nation founded upon law, and to survive its citizens must respect the law. Not even the war in Vietnam poses the threat to our democracy as does this growing belief that laws can be broken whenever it suits what someone considers a noble purpose.

We are not maintaining that the law is sacrosanct. But we are saying that Msgr. Rice or anyone else does not have the right to frivolously violate the law even in the name of a just cause. To tolerate this is to invite anarchy.⁴⁷

Hundreds of angry letters were sent to Holy Rosary, the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, and Bishop Wright. Irate Catholics noted their disgust with Rice, with one denouncing, “A new breed” of priests “dedicated more to the New Left than to God.” Another objected to Rice “using your high office in our church to give your unpopular views on Vietnam as a representative of our Church.” The Pittsburgh chapter of the Legion of St. Michael informed Wright that they had urged the FBI to gather “conclusive evidence of the Communist influence prevailing in the various ‘front’ organizations with which the Monsignor chooses to associate himself.” Meanwhile, a local post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars wrote to Wright in 1967 protesting “the radical actions of Monsignor Rice” which gave “comfort and support to the enemy.

Such comfort prolongs the war as surely as if Monsignor Rice aimed the gun of the enemy.”⁴⁸

Others told Wright and Rice that their children were good Catholics who could not afford to go to college and avoid Vietnam with a student draft deferment. Given that one-quarter of Notre Dame’s male students admitted they were attending college to avoid the draft, Rice had inadvertently tripped over a widening class schism within the Catholic Church. Rice lamented the class-bias of the draft and expressed his sympathy for blue-collar Catholics. However, he then undercut himself by noting to an antiwar audience in Cleveland that the children of steel workers who did not go to college were often “not terribly bright.”⁴⁹

In 1969, Rice and Pittsburgh activists found themselves even more estranged from working-class Catholics. That year a group calling itself the Black Construction Coalition (BCC) demanded hiring quotas in the building trades, arguing that since blacks were 21 percent of the Pittsburgh population they should have 21 percent of the construction jobs. (Of the 30,000 building trades members in the Pittsburgh region, 2,100—7 percent—were black.) The Black Construction Coalition further insisted that a quarter of the blacks hired receive their jobs as “reparations” for having served prison sentences.⁵⁰

For several weeks in August and September of 1969, 2,000 black and 1,000 white pickets captured national media attention by shutting down ten construction sites. Pittsburgh police officers arrested 200 demonstrators for blocking traffic. Some BCC pickets responded by squirting Chemical Mace at the police. Counter-demonstrations by laid-off construction workers grew larger and angrier. A handful of priests and nuns, including the president of Pittsburgh’s Carlow College, Sister Jane Fadgen, picketed construction sites. Later in the fall they marched on the downtown St. Mary of Mercy Church after its assistant pastor had suggested, “that those who believe in the raised clenched fist return to the gutters from which they and their ideas were illegitimately born.” CIC member James McCoy, a United Steel Workers’ district staff member, had earlier lamented that unions were not living up to the Christian ideals as set forth by Rice and the late Philip Murray.⁵¹

The Pittsburgh NAACP, the CIC, the ADA, the Peace and Freedom Center, and Rice charged that the white, largely Catholic membership of the construction trades deliberately excluded blacks. Gerald Kaufman, with the enthusiastic support of the (Protestant) Pittsburgh Area Council of Churches, proposed a law giving the state of Pennsylvania jurisdiction over admission to union apprenticeship programs. Union members countered that few blacks

had applied for and completed apprenticeship programs. Others noted that they had gone through a lengthy, poorly compensated apprenticeship—up to five years for sheet metal workers—and blacks should “do the same.” As one ironworker bluntly informed *Business Week*, “I don’t mind working with a nigger, but when you are up on top of that steel with someone, he better know the ropes.” In truth, the situation was more complex than either side allowed. While there was a shortage of qualified blacks, white unionists often reserved apprenticeships for their male children and many looked upon blacks as not quite human.⁵²

To the dismay of Pittsburgh’s Democratic politicians, the BCC had launched its protest just prior to the mayoral election. Councilman Peter Flaherty, a World War II veteran and Catholic native of the Iron City, had captured the Democratic mayoral nomination despite the opposition of a party machine that did not trust him. Normally, winning the spring primary meant victory in the fall election. Sensing opportunity, conservatives insisted that the GOP nominee, Pennsylvania Labor Secretary John Tabor, conduct a vigorous law-and-order campaign while liberal Republicans wanted him to embrace the BCC. Tabor sought to appease both wings by denouncing racism *and* disruptive civil rights protests. Some Democrats swung to his side, with the 13,000 Pittsburgh members of the Millwrights, Boilermakers, Plasterers union locals, as well as the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, offering their endorsement.⁵³

Seeing a story, reporters descended on Pittsburgh to write yet another story of Catholic-black conflict. However, to the delight of national Democratic strategists Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg, Flaherty conducted a “moderating, rather than a divisive, election.” Though Flaherty had journeyed to the disastrous 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago to endorse Humphrey, he believed that the war was a lost cause requiring a graduated, but not hasty, withdrawal. On crime, Flaherty vowed to rehabilitate drug addicts but lock up dope pushers. As for the BCC—*The New Republic* scornfully reported—Flaherty refused to be drawn out. Instead, he changed the subject, denouncing Pittsburgh’s corporate benefactors for focusing revitalization funds on the downtown and neglecting other neighborhoods. Flaherty’s charges shocked the city’s executives. Not even during the Depression had David Lawrence permitted Mellon-baiting. When James Cunningham apprised Flaherty that the 7/11 Club had endorsed him, Flaherty informed him that if his group made its preference known, he would publicly repudiate them.⁵⁴

Flaherty defeated his Republican opponent. White liberals felt they had to vote for the proverbial lesser of two evils while working-class Catholics believed Flaherty had sufficiently distanced himself from the secular and religious Left. It also helped that several weeks before the mayoral election, Pope Paul VI had elevated Wright to the rank of Cardinal and relocated him to the Vatican. Wright's departure removed a major irritant—or champion of social justice, depending upon whom was speaking—from the diocese. His successor, Vincent Leonard, had been one of nine children sired by a Pittsburgh steel worker. While Leonard shared some of Wright's politics—he would not invest diocesan funds “in companies that produce napalm or contraceptives”—he let it be known that “stability” would be restored.⁵⁵

Mirroring their Catholic counterparts, more than three-quarters of black voters turned out for Flaherty. Although there may have been some notion that Flaherty was merely the lesser evil, it was possible that the activists did not speak for the majority of blacks. To the dismay of academics that surveyed race relations in six American cities, Pittsburgh blacks at the end of the 1960s were seemingly unique. On average, two-thirds of Pittsburgh's blacks had positive feelings toward the police. In five other U.S. cities, an average of just 17 percent of blacks approved of their local police. (These proportions held true as well in the black evaluation of urban education and housing.) One explanation was that since Pittsburgh did not have a single contiguous ghetto, its black population, scattered in eight neighborhoods, never ideologically coalesced. Another explanation was that Pittsburgh's New Deal Democrats had always given blacks some consideration.⁵⁶

Flaherty's election confounded Rice who would soon accuse the new mayor of “catering to racial bigotry” in his opposition to court-ordered public-school busing. Just as depressing to Rice, Wright's exit deprived him of an important ally. Inexorably, his alienation from blue-collar Catholics grew, with Rice in 1970 writing in *The Catholic World* that, “The rank and file are a problem, not only because they do not appreciate the outspoken and rebellious young, but also because they tend to be racially bigoted and militaristic.” Although Rice stated that while “one has to have compassion for all, even the bigoted ordinary Catholic with his narrow outlook,” such people could not be allowed to control the Catholic Church.⁵⁷

In 1971, Rice and Cunningham ran unsuccessfully for the city council. Neither candidate scored well outside Pittsburgh's university, WASP, and Jewish precincts. Ironically, Rice and Cunningham were victims of a Progressive Era electoral reform that had been designed to limit the influence

of blue-collar Catholics. Concerned that working-class constituencies wielded too much power through their neighborhood representatives, middle-class Protestant reformers had shifted to at-large, instead of ward-based, elections. This change favored those with the resources to conduct citywide campaigns. Once the Democratic party came to power with the advent of the Depression, only those whom the machine endorsed—or, in the case of Flaherty—tolerated, could win municipal elections. Consequently, the professional classes Rice and Cunningham represented wielded power in their immediate neighborhoods and, eventually, the national Democratic party, but not in the city and Western Pennsylvania.⁵⁸

While Rice politicked locally, wrote articles and book reviews for several Catholic magazines, and spoke at national anti-war rallies, Holy Rosary was coming apart. Since his arrival, an additional 205 mostly white families had fled the parish—leaving just 474 black and white families behind. On several occasions, black youths assaulted Holy Rosary's parishioners as they entered and left Mass. Rice refused to call the police, arguing that it would only spark a riot.⁵⁹

Pittsburgh's ghetto priest also defended the Black Panthers, claiming that they were law-abiding victims of a racist frame-up orchestrated by the FBI. Rice did, however, call on the police at least once when he stumbled across 200 sticks of dynamite secreted on church grounds. He subsequently learned that Bouie Haden thought Holy Rosary was the safest place to store the dynamite until it was needed to blow up "genocidal" Planned Parenthood clinics. In his *Pittsburgh Catholic* column, Rice continued to praise Haden as a civil rights activist who "does not advocate violence."⁶⁰

If there were any doubts that activist clergy and Democratic politicians were on the outs with socially conservative unionists and working-class Catholics, the primary and general election results of 1972 should have removed them. A week before the presidential primary a third of the city's white public school students joined a one-day boycott of classes. They were protesting proposals to impose busing as a way to achieve racial integration. Primed by the boycott, Democrats gave antiwar and school busing advocate George McGovern a distant third place finish in Allegheny County—running 30,000 votes behind George Wallace and Hubert Humphrey. With 48 percent of registered Democrats participating in the primary, Humphrey received 32 percent of the votes, Wallace 31 percent, McGovern 20 percent, Maine senator Edmund Muskie 15 percent, and Washington senator Henry Jackson 2 percent.⁶¹

McGovern carried mostly the same kinds of voters who had supported Rice and Cunningham in their 1971 city council races. Although Wallace, who had been endorsed by the Pittsburgh Fraternal Order of Police, finished a surprising second—prompting local NAACP president Byrd Brown to decry the “racist vote”—he would have been much further behind had Muskie not siphoned votes from Humphrey. Polish-Americans in the 2nd, 6th, and 9th wards abutting the Allegheny River—acting out of a sense of ethnic solidarity—went for Muskie. Pittsburgh’s South Side, as well as McKeesport and Clairton—which were in little danger of finding any blacks to be integrated with—gave Wallace paper-thin margins of victory. McGovern was a cipher in both Catholic and black neighborhoods.⁶²

Despite McGovern’s repudiation by Western Pennsylvania voters, the ADA and the 7/11 Club were confident that he would be victorious in the general election. Rice wrote that, “McGovern smells like a winner.” Chicago mayor Richard Daley, Rice contended, though he had been scorned at the 1972 Democratic National Convention, would have to vote for McGovern. As for AFL-CIO president George Meany, the rank and file would never follow his advice to reject both McGovern and Nixon. “Labor leaders,” Rice believed, “are not necessarily bright politicians.” The ADA and the 7/11 Club activists—a number of whom worked on McGovern’s campaign—misread the temper of the electorate.⁶³

Nationally, McGovern lost Catholics, workers, and southern whites to Nixon. In Pennsylvania, McGovern carried a single county—Philadelphia. Locally, ADA chair Molly Yard reported, 107,097 Democrats in Allegheny County sat out the election. That figure represented 19 percent of the county’s registered Democrats. (Most of these voters had participated in earlier elections. Overall voter participation in the county stood at 77 percent—22 percentage points higher than the national turnout but 8 points lower than the county’s turnout in 1968.) Just as demoralizing, many Democrats voted Republican. If one assumed that all 23,757 registered independents and third party members supported Nixon, then at least 60,572 Democrats—11 percent of the county total—forsook McGovern.⁶⁴

Marginally higher turnouts in Pittsburgh’s 7th, 11th, and 14th wards and the Hill District could not make up the deficits recorded in the city’s Catholic neighborhoods and mill towns. Nixon carried Allegheny County decisively, though whether or not he made any permanent converts to the GOP remained to be seen. Between 1968 and 1972 the GOP had been able

to increase its voter registration share by just 22,618, raising their (largely suburban) total to 283,391 as compared to the Democrats' county registration of 564,564.⁶⁵

Some Catholic activists had sensed impending disaster. Michael Novak, a reporter for *The Commonweal*, a liberal Catholic magazine, had accompanied Democratic vice presidential candidate Sargent Shriver on his tours through the steel towns of Pennsylvania and Illinois:

Mr. Shriver was greeted with scarcely veiled disdain, I thought, by workers at the gates of the Homestead [Pennsylvania] Steel mills—my own kind of folks, who would normally be with us by upwards of 89 percent. In Joliet, Illinois, on a factory floor where I encountered dozens of Slovak faces that made me think of my cousins in Johnstown [Pennsylvania], workers did not want to shake McGovern-Shriver hands. Trying to find out why, I met with our “advance person”—a young woman wearing a miniskirt, high white boots, and a see-through blouse, with a large pro-abortion button on her collar. On that factory floor in 1972, the clash of social classes and cultural politics could scarcely have been more discordant.⁶⁶

Rice dismissed Novak as an apologist for George Wallace and argued that, “the students and professors of this nation, of the type that the Wallace’s hate, strained their guts and often shed their blood in the fight against racism and militarism.” Turning to Father Andrew Greeley, a University of Chicago sociologist who argued that Catholics were repulsed by “the strategies of the flag-burners and the purveyors of liturgical gestures,” Rice informed the *National Catholic Reporter* that:

It is illogical to blame sins on those who fight sin but Father Greeley seems to be doing that as he puts down Catholic activists and propagandists for provoking reaction. Long before there was a great clutch of Catholic pushers for social decency, the Catholic masses acted badly on the race question. I saw it in the unions, even the CIO.⁶⁷

James Hitchcock, a historian at St. Louis University, rallied to Greeley’s defense. Hitchcock pointed out that Rice was himself a bigot who, in a 1972 address at New York University, had observed that priests were “repelled by their fellow Catholics and cannot stand the thought of devoting their good

lives to such an awful crew.” Pronouncing his assessment of Rice and the activist priests Daniel and Philip Berrigan, Hitchcock concluded that:

The worldly wisdom of the radical Catholic is now merely leftist conventional wisdom. The radical strangeness of the Catholic Worker Movement over several decades, the fact (disconcerting both to conservative Catholics and radical non-believers) that orthodox religious belief obviously lies at the heart of Dorothy Day’s dissent, is now largely absent from progressive religious circles, and is usually deliberately excluded. There is almost nothing to distinguish the worldly stance of a self-proclaimed “Catholic” radical from that of an atheist.⁶⁸

Hitchcock’s assessment of Rice and other religious activists would not have encountered much disagreement among working-class Catholics in Western Pennsylvania.

In the aftermath of the divisive 1960s, Rice became disillusioned with the Left. He noticed that most college students lost interest in the peace movement once Selective Service reforms and diminished troops calls removed the threat of being sent to Vietnam. To the disconcertment of his non-Catholic allies, Rice’s social conservatism, which was not an issue within the Left during the escalation of the Vietnam War and the racial confrontations of the 1960s, loomed larger in the 1970s. In the context of the awakening women’s’ liberation movement, Rice’s insistence that the “oppression of women” was not “similar to oppression of blacks,” as well as his opposition to the ordination of women and unswerving support for Paul VI’s 1968 anti-birth control encyclical, *Humane Vitae*, seemed archaic—even sexist. On the subject of divorce and remarriage Rice pulled no punches, “there is always a floating pool of divorced persons looking like lint, for someone to cling to.”⁶⁹

Following the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision, Rice’s views on abortion, based upon Church teaching, concerns about racial genocide, and belief that reverence for life required a rejection of both the Vietnam War and legalized abortion, led Molly Yard, the ADA, and the ACLU to repudiate him. In 1974, Charles Robb, the Executive Director of the Pittsburgh ACLU and, like Rice, a member of the Peace and Freedom Center, issued the unkindest cut of all. “The state,” Robb informed his fellow ACLU board member, “should not enroll as God’s agent (in such issues as abortion). If God is not pleased, He can send the individual to Purgatory afterward.”

Hurt, Rice shot back that the ACLU had made “a slur on our faith in God, whom we love more than Charlie Robb.”⁷⁰

Sadly for Rice, his opposition to abortion and embrace of moral traditionalism did not win back many members of the Catholic laity. Still fewer paid heed to his repeated warnings that the steel industry faced growing foreign competition and an aging plant that, even if modernized, would still throw thousands of people out of work. Rice’s embrace of the civil rights and antiwar movements led Catholic unionists to ignore his economic forecasts. They were soon caught off-guard by what University of Pittsburgh historian Roy Lubove described as “a wrenching industrial revolution in reverse” which would decimate the ranks of the steel workers’ and other industrial unions.⁷¹

Rice’s later efforts to re-create the antiwar coalition of the 1960s by attacking President Ronald Reagan’s anti-Communist foreign policy in the 1980s fizzled in part because white-collar social liberals saw him as on the wrong side of “gender issues.” This was the final irony of Rice’s political career. More publicized Catholic clerical activists such as Daniel Berrigan and his brother Philip had been tied to campus constituencies—the former at LeMoyné College and Cornell University, and the latter at the Newburgh, New York, Josephite Seminary. Neither had any serious links to unions and the urban parishes that had formed the base of the Catholic Church and the New Deal Democratic party. Rice’s support for antiwar and black protest was notable precisely because of what he had once represented to the Church and the Democratic party.

Rebuffed in the 1960s, Rice left his working-class Catholic base to seek allies among white-collar professionals, campus constituencies, Protestants, and Reform Jews. At first, such activists embraced Rice as a prized convert from the cause of anti-Communism; ultimately, they forsook him because he was too Catholic. Weary of the struggle to keep Holy Rosary afloat, Rice in 1976 received permission to transfer to St. Anne’s in Castle Shannon. Philip Murray had been buried at St. Anne’s and perhaps, as some of his sympathizers have suggested, Monsignor Charles Owen Rice needed a constant reminder of a happier time when Catholics, New Deal Democrats, and union members were seemingly indivisible.⁷²

NOTES

1. The author gratefully acknowledges the insightful commentary of Christopher Shannon as well as the dedicated archivists at the University of Pittsburgh, Notre Dame, the Diocese of Pittsburgh, and Arizona State University.

- Gregory L. Schneider, *Cadres for Conservatism: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of the Contemporary Right* (New York: New York University Press, 1999); Rebecca E. Klatch, *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Rick Perlstein, *Before the Storm: Barry Goldwater and the Unmaking of the American Consensus* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001); Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995).
2. Ronald P. Formisano, *Boston Against Busing: Race, Class, and Ethnicity in the 1960s and 1970s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991); Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); Jonathan Rieder, *Carnarsie: The Jews and Italians of Brooklyn against Liberalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985); Samuel G. Freedman, *The Inheritance: How Three Families and America Moved from Roosevelt to Reagan* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996); Samuel Lubell, *The Hidden Crisis in American Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971), 110, 125; John T. McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Gerald Gamm, *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).
 3. Ronald Radosh, *Divided They Fell: The Demise of the Democratic Party, 1964–1996* (New York: The Free Press, 1996); Steven M. Gillon, *Politics and Vision: The ADA and American Liberalism, 1947–1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
 4. Kevin P. Phillips, *The Emerging Republican Majority* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1970), 166; Kenneth Heineman, "The Silent Majority Speaks: Antiwar Protest and Backlash, 1965–1972," *Peace & Change* 17 (October 1992): 402–33; Andrew M. Greeley, *Building Coalitions: American Politics in the 1970s* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1974), 186, 356.
 5. Charles Murray, *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950–1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1984), 117, 126–27; *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States*, 1960 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1961); *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States*, 1969 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1970); Harlan Hahn and Joe R. Feagin, "Rank-and-File Versus Congressional Perceptions of Ghetto Riots," *Social Science Quarterly* 51 (September 1970): 361–73; Lubell, *The Hidden Crisis in American Politics*, 105.
 6. Kenneth J. Heineman, *A Catholic New Deal: Religion and Reform in Depression Pittsburgh* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1999), 113–212.
 7. *Ibid.*, 177–200.
 8. Frank Hawkins, "David Lawrence: Boss of the Mellon Patch," *Harper's Magazine* 213 (August 1956): 55–61; Michael P. Weber, *Don't Call Me Boss: David L. Lawrence, Pittsburgh's Renaissance Mayor* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988), 228–92, 315–38; Steven P. Erie, *Rainbow's End: Irish-Americans and the Dilemmas of Urban Machine Politics, 1840–1985* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 116–17; Park H. Martin, "Pittsburgh Comprehensive Improvement Program," *Transactions* 121 (1956): 885–92; "Pennsylvania: The Old Class," *Time* 88 (2 December 1966): 28–29; "The 'Boss' Was Drafted," *Newsweek* 51 (17 March 1958): 31–32; "So Pennsylvania Goes?" *Newsweek* 52 (20 October 1958): 41–42; "Mighty Boss," *Time* 70 (4 November 1957): 20.

9. Theodore Humes, Memorandum, 1964, "Political Attitudes Gained from Visits to Heavily Ethnic Neighborhoods in Three U.S. Cities," (Arizona Historical Foundation, Arizona State University (AZF), Theodore Humes Papers, Box 1); Theodore Humes letter to William Gill, 1 August 1965 (AZF, Theodore Humes Papers, Box 1); Theodore Humes letter to Ray Pitcairn, 19 November 1965 (AZF, Theodore Humes Papers, Box 1). Analysis of data provided by *County of Allegheny Official Tabulations of Ballots Cast for All Major Offices, General Election, 3 November 1964* (Archives of an Industrial Society, University of Pittsburgh (AIS)), reveals that black and ethnic Italian and Polish neighborhoods often gave 80 percent or more of their votes to Lyndon Johnson.
10. Heineman, *A Catholic New Deal*; David Caute, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978), 108–110, 216–23, 376–91; "Labor Priests," *Fortune* 39 (January 1949): 151; Victor Riesel and Aaron Levenstein, "Labor Priests," n.d., 1948 (AIS, Charles Owen Rice Papers (COR), Box 15); Charles R. Morris, *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church* (New York: Times Books, 1997), 213, 218; Charles Owen Rice, "Policy and Action," *Commonweal* 28 (29 July 1938): 366–67. The Pennsylvania ADA was the third largest state chapter after New York and California in the 1960s.
11. Willmore Kendall to Charles Rice, 21 September 1954 (COR, AIS, Box 15); Charles Rice to Willmore Kendall, 8 October 1954 (AIS, COR, Box 15); Charles Rice to the Editor of the *Brooklyn Tablet*, 21 September 1954 (AIS, COR, Box 15).
12. Charles Owen Rice, "A Case for Castro?" *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 15 February 1962; Charles Owen Rice, "The Meek Shall Inherit," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 23 May 1963; Charles Owen Rice, "Suggested Solution," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 20 June 1963; Charles Owen Rice, "Diem Post-Mortem," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 6 February 1964.
13. Charles Owen Rice, "The Worst Evil?" *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 5 September 1963.
14. Jon Bixler, "'Labor Priest' Raps Unions on War," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 28 October 1967; Charles Owen Rice, "The Whiplash," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 3 March 1964; Charles Owen Rice, "Housing Dilemma," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 3 March 1960; Charles Owen Rice, "Negro Workers," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 10 March 1960; Charles Owen Rice, "UE Plots Future," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 5 May 1960; Charles Owen Rice, "A Certain Swagger," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 10 November 1960; Charles Rice, "Statement for Press Conference on Behalf of Mobilization Committee," 22 August 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23).
15. Patrick J. McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice: Apostle of Contradiction* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1989), 148.
16. John Wright to Charles Rice, 26 March 1962 (AIS, COR, Box 32); Charles Owen Rice, "Social Action," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 2 August 1962; Charles Owen Rice, "Lay Discontent," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 20 September 1962; Charles Owen Rice, "Self-Analysis," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 11 October 1962; Charles Owen Rice, "Christlike Vicar," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 6 June 1963; Nat Kline, "Wright Prays, Works 17 Hours," *Boston Globe*, 29 March 1969; Linda Charlton, "Activist Labor Priest: Charles Owen Rice," *New York Times*, 10 January 1970; John Cardinal Wright (Biographical), 23 May 1969 (Diocese of Pittsburgh Archives (DPA), John Wright Papers, Box 1); Charles Owen Rice, "Cardinal Wright as Bishop," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 26 May 1972; "The Bishop's Hair Shirt," *The Nation* 202 (11 April 1968): 411.

17. Henry Carlin to Hugh Boyle, 8 September 1947 (DPA, Henry Carlin Papers, Box 1); "Holy Rosary Parish Statistics, 1920-1970," (DPA, Holy Rosary Parish Records, Box 1); Lou Florian, "Monsignor Rice is Tackling Problems in New Distressed Area Parish with Usual Zeal," *Washington (Pennsylvania) Observer*, 14 March 1966; "Inner City Problems Peril Nation, Says Rice," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 17 March 1966; Roy Lubove, *Twentieth Century Pittsburgh: Government, Business, and Environmental Change* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969), 165.
18. Fraternal Order of Police, Fort Pitt Lodge 1, Riot Fact Finding Committee, 7 April 1968 (AIS, COR, Box 11); Charles Owen Rice, "Pat Fagan and the DA," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 28 September 1968; National Committee to Combat Fascism, leaflets, 1969 (AIS, Paul LeBlanc Papers (PLB), Box 1).
19. Michael Snow interview with Aldo Colautti, Executive Secretary to Pittsburgh Mayor Joseph Barr, 31 July 1998, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (AIS, State and Local Government Oral History Project); Roger Stuart, "Barr Backs Law, Order Police Move," *Pittsburgh Press*, 29 June 1968; Jack Garner, "Protesters of 'Brutality' Get 'No Satisfaction' from Mayor," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 29 June 1968.
20. Arden E. Melzer, "A Commentary on the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders," Prepared for the Human Relations Commission of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, 14 June 1968 (AIS, COR, Box 7a); Bohdian Hodiak and Alvin W. Rosensweet, "Cardinal Wright Mourned Here," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 21 August 1979; McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice*, 188; Charles Owen Rice, "Bouie Haden's Case," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 11 July 1969.
21. Clifford C. Ham, Jr., "The Neighborhood Church in Urban Extension," ACTION-Housing Report, August 1964 (AIS, COR, Box 1).
22. John Wright to Donald McIlvane, 25 March 1964 (University of Notre Dame Archives (UND), Donald McIlvane Papers (DM), Box 8); Catholic Interracial Council of Pittsburgh Direct Action Committee Minutes, 14 February 1967 (UND, DM, Box 2); "Bishop Wright's Challenge," *America* 115 (24 September 1966): 310; Catholic Interracial Council of Pittsburgh Membership Lists of Clergy and Laity, 1965 (AIS, CIC, Box 1). Surname analysis based on 456 individuals.
23. Catholic Interracial Council, Pittsburgh Chapter (CIC) Pittsburgh Membership Lists of Clergy and Laity, 1965. I was able to identify 376 lay members for residence. I excluded individuals who gave business and school addresses, as well as those who gave incomplete addresses.
24. *Equality*, Newsletter of the Catholic Interracial Council of Pittsburgh, August 1962 (AIS, NAACP, Pittsburgh Branch, Papers, Box 41); Donald McIlvane to William Marm, president of the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Knights of Columbus, 28 July 1966 (UND, DM, Box 2); William Marm to Donald McIlvane, 20 July 1966 (UND, DM, Box 2); Robert F. Eckerle, President, Pittsburgh CIC, to John Wright, 11 April 1966 (UND, DM, Box 2); Robert Eckerle, President, Pittsburgh CIC, to John Wright, 15 April 1966 (UND, DM, Box 2); "A Statement by the Pittsburgh Catholic Interracial Council on the Lack of Integration Plans by the Catholic School Board of the Diocese of Pittsburgh," 22 October 1969 (UND, DM, Box 2).
25. CIC Membership List, 1965; Ad Hoc Committee to End the War in Vietnam Membership List, 1965-1966 (UND, DM, Box 1); Charles Owen Rice, "My Brother, Pat," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 28 May 1971.
26. Analysis of the Western Pennsylvania ADA, the Ad Hoc Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the Pittsburgh Peace and Freedom Center, and the 7/11 Democratic Club drawn from organizational newsletters, newspaper clippings, circulars, and membership lists found in the Archives of an

REFORMATION

- Industrial Society, University of Pittsburgh, and the McIlvane Papers at the University of Notre Dame Archives. See, for example, *ADA News*, 25 November 1968 (AIS, COR, Box 2); Pittsburgh Chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action, Officers and Members of the Board of Directors for the Year 1968–1969 (AIS, COR, Box 2); Americans for Democratic Action, Pittsburgh Chapter, Membership List, November 1969 (AIS, ADA, Pittsburgh Chapter, Papers, Box 5); “Three Faiths Offer Viet Peace Prayers,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 12 July 1966; 7/11 Democratic Club Membership Lists, 1969, 1970, 1973 (AIS, 7/11 Democratic Club Records, Box 1); Ad Hoc Committee to End the War in Vietnam, “Announcing a Debate, Vietnam: Two Views,” leaflet, 28 February 1966 (UND, DM, Box 1); Ad Hoc Committee to End the War in Vietnam letter to President Lyndon Johnson, 15 July 1965 (UND, DM, Box 1); Ad Hoc Committee to End the War in Vietnam, Membership List, 1965–1966. I also consulted every issue of the *Pittsburgh Peace and Freedom News* that could be found at the University of Pittsburgh Archives (AIS, Peace and Freedom Center, Pittsburgh Chapter (PFC), Box 1). Also useful was Ida Cohen Selavan, ed., *My Voice Was Heard* (New York: Ktav Publishing House and National Council of Jewish Women, Pittsburgh Section, 1981), 78, 86, 109, 120, 130, 133, 166, 191, 195, 197, 214–215, 217, 219–220, 238, 245, 249, 253–254.
27. Charles Owen Rice, “More Bail Injustice Than Ever,” *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 7 July 1972; Heineman, *A Catholic New Deal*, 10, 18, 21, 30, 65, 85, 104.
 28. I consulted the *Polk’s City Directory for Pittsburgh* (1965, 1966, 1968, 1970, 1972) when examining the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee, the ADA, the 7/11 Club, and the Peace and Freedom Center. Members who lived outside the city and did not have a business address in Pittsburgh could not generally be identified by occupation.

Occupation

ADA (1)	Housewife 35 percent	University 10 percent	Lawyer 9 percent	Business 13 percent
Ad Hoc (2)	University 36 percent	Clergy 23 percent	Housewife 13 percent	Media 5 percent
7/11 (3)	Housewife 38 percent	Retiree 12 percent	University 8 percent	Student 8 percent
Peace and Freedom (4)	University 27 percent	Student 16 percent	Clergy 12 percent	Housewife 11 percent

(1) N=605 of which 75 percent identified. Proportion employed as blue collar (0 percent) and private sector-employed as lawyers, doctors, journalists, and engineers/researchers/scientists (30 percent). ADA database covers 1966 to 1972.

(2) N=86 (the entire membership) of which 90 percent identified. Proportion employed as blue collar (zero) and as in the private sector (12 percent). The Ad Hoc Committee covers 1965 to 1967, its years of operation.

(3) N=294 (the entire membership) of which 85 percent identified. Proportion blue collar (less than 1 percent). Database covers the 7/11 Club from its inception in 1968 to 1973.

(4) N=175 of which 74 percent identified. Proportion blue collar (2 percent) and private sector-engineer/researcher/scientist (4 percent). The Peace and Freedom Center was Pittsburgh's clearing-house for civil rights and antiwar protest. This database covers the period from 1967 to 1972.

I created the category of "activist" for those individuals who were engaged in full-time organizing. For all four groups combined the total number of such people was seven, of which two were labor organizers. I did not count labor organizers as blue collar since the nature of their work was intellectual, not physical, and the fact that such people by the late 1960s often had advanced education that made them more closely resemble professionals.

29. Bruce M. Stave, *The New Deal and the Last Hurrah: Pittsburgh Machine Politics* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1970), 42; John Bodnar, Roger Simon, and Michael Weber, *Lives of Their Own: Blacks, Italians, and Poles in Pittsburgh, 1900-1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983), 193. Residence determined by archival documents, *Polk's City Directory for Pittsburgh*, and cross-referenced by zip codes and *Yahoo.com* map searches. The 1969 ADA Pittsburgh Chapter Membership List helpfully provided addresses for those living outside Pittsburgh. By definition, 7/11 Club members lived in Shadyside and (overwhelmingly) Highland Park.

		Residence		
ADA (1)	Squirrel Hill	Oakland University District	Highland Park	Shadyside
	30 percent	9 percent	9 percent	8 percent
Ad Hoc (2)	Squirrel Hill	Oakland University District	Point Breeze	Highland Park
	34 percent	13 percent	9 percent	7 percent
Peace and Freedom (3)	Squirrel Hill	Oakland University District	Highland Park	Point Breeze
	31 percent	20 percent	12 percent	6 percent

(1) N=605 of which 98 percent identified.

(2) N=77 of which 81 percent identified. Point Breeze was, like Shadyside, an elite "East End" neighborhood.

(3) N=157 of which 67 percent identified.

30. Michael Snow interview with Richard Thornburgh, former Pennsylvania governor, 21 July 1999, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (AIS, State and Local Government Oral History Project); Ed Wintermantel, "Vietnam Speak-Out Urges Negotiation, De-escalation," *Pittsburgh Press*, 5 November 1966; Robert Johnson, "At Panel Discussion in Oakland, Protest Viet War, Unions Urged," *Pittsburgh Press*, 22 April 1967; Richard Thornburgh to James Dunn, 16 October 1968 (UND, DM, Box 7); "Statement by NAACP Police Affairs Committee to District Attorney Robert Duggan," 15 October 1968 (UND, DM, Box 7); Joseph P. Browne, "Duggan Blasts Back at High

- Bond Critics," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 15 October 1968; Alvin Rosensweet, "NAACP Hits Duggan On High Bond Stand," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 16 October 1968.
31. J. David Greenstone and Paul E. Peterson, *Race and Authority in Urban Politics: Community Participation and the War on Poverty* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 20; James Cunningham, *The Resurgent Neighborhood* (Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, 1965), 53–54, 86–88, 99.
32. Cunningham, *The Resurgent Neighborhood*, 53–54, 86–88, 99.
33. *ADA News*, 17 January 1972 (AIS, COR, Box 2); *7/11 News*, February 1969 (AIS, 7/11 Democratic Club Records, Box 1); Wyndle Watson, "Life Gets Priority in March Here," *Pittsburgh Press*, 16 April 1970. In the 1930s Yard had been a member of the Swarthmore branch of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the parent organization of the SDS.
34. Charles Owen Rice, "ADA Goes it Alone," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 23 February 1968; Charles Rice letter to Alan Kistler, 11 March 1968 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Charles C. Robb, "ADA's Forgotten Word—'McCarthy'," *Pittsburgh Point*, 21 March 1968; "Kaufman Backs McGovern Bid," *Pittsburgh Press*, 10 January 1972; Joseph Clark to Donald McIlvane, 15 August 1966 (UND, DM, Box 1); Joseph S. Clark Press Release, "Clark Gives Preliminary Impressions of Southeast Asia Visit," 30 January 1968 (UND, DM, Box 1); Hugh Scott to Donald McIlvane, 20 July 1966 and 17 May 1967 (UND, DM, Box 1). Pennsylvania's Republican Senator, Hugh Scott, was a consistent supporter of the war in Vietnam. Voting data taken from the *Pennsylvania Manual, 1968–1969*, vol. 99 (Harrisburg: Department of Property and Supplies, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1969). In Allegheny County, Clark ran behind Humphrey by 32,241 votes, and 42,829 votes behind his own 1962 performance. Democrats who voted for Richard Schweiker were not prepared to endorse Nixon. Schweiker bested Nixon in Pittsburgh by 23,959 votes, 39 percent to 26 percent.
35. William Shaffer to Charles Rice, 16 October 1969 (AIS, COR, Box 23); "UE Peace Stand Applauded by 1,500 in Pittsburgh," *UE News*, 28 November 1966; Western Pennsylvania Trade Union Division of SANE, to Supporters, 28 December 1966 (AIS, COR, Box 21); Western Pennsylvania Trade Union Division of SANE, Minutes, 4 December 1966 (AIS, COR, Box 21); Proposed Statement of Policy of the Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace, Chicago, Illinois, 11–12 November 1967 (AIS, PLB, Box 1).
36. Statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council on Vietnam, Bal Harbor, Florida, 24 February 1967 (AIS, PLB, Box 1); Kenneth J. Heineman, *Put Your Bodies Upon the Wheels: Student Revolt in the 1960s* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2001), 61.
37. Charles Owen Rice, "SDS Evaluated," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 1 August 1969; Charles Owen Rice, "George Meany," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 2 October 1970; James R. Sena, "Labor Priest? 'Not Any More'," *National Catholic Register*, 22 January 1970; Charles Rice letter and Book Review to Terry F. Brock, *National Catholic Reporter*, 10 July 1972 (AIS, COR, Box 17).
38. Raymond E. Wolfinger and John Osgood Field, "Political Ethos and the Structure of City Government," *American Political Science Review* 60 (June 1966): 306–26; Heineman, *Put Your Bodies Upon the Wheels*, 61–62.
39. Pittsburgh Vietnam Summer, "Project Profile: Pittsburgh Working Class Organizing," 1967 (AIS, PLB, Box 1); Vietnam Summer Headquarters, Cambridge, Massachusetts, "Worklist #6," 1967 (AIS, PLB, Box 1).

40. Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 130; Heineman, *Put Your Bodies Upon the Wheels*, 55–80; “Peace Demonstrators Due Here Monday,” *Pittsburgh Press*, 11 October 1967; Ralph Hallow, “Peace Torch Sparks Anti-War Rally Here,” *Pittsburgh Press*, 17 October 1967; “Peace Torch March Due in City Monday,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 11 October 1967; Charles C. Robb, “Peace Torch Flickers Through Pittsburgh,” *Pittsburgh Point*, 19 October 1967.
41. Michael Lind, *Vietnam, The Necessary War: A Reinterpretation of America's Most Disastrous Military Conflict* (New York: Free Press, 1999), 109–11; Heineman, *Put Your Bodies Upon the Wheels*, 76.
42. Milan Simonich, “Vietnam 25 Years Later: How Vietnam Got to McKeesport,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 7 May 2000; Heineman, *Put Your Bodies Upon the Wheels*, 76.
43. Charles Owen Rice, “Clerical Militarism,” *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 5 January 1967;
44. Heineman, *Put Your Bodies Upon the Wheels*, 87–90; Nancy Zaroulis and Gerald Sullivan, *Who Spoke Up? American Protest Against the War in Vietnam, 1963–1975* (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 110. For the standard history of Clergy and Laymen (later renamed Laity) Concerned About Vietnam, see Mitchell K. Hall, *Because of Their Faith: CALCAV and Religious Opposition to the Vietnam War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).
45. Joseph O'Meara, “No Man is Above the Law,” *American Bar Association Journal* 53 (December 1967): 1107–10; McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice*, 182; James F. Andrews to Charles Rice, 2 December 1966 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Charles Owen Rice, “Amen (Corner),” *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 4 May 1967; “Msgr. Rice Challenged on Vietnam Views,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 20 January 1967.
46. Heineman, *A Catholic New Deal*, 156–57; Thomas C. Reeves, *America's Bishop: The Life and Times of Fulton J. Sheen* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2001), 192, 309–10; Charles Rice letter to Thomas Cornell, 8 August 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23). Cornell and other followers of Dorothy Day founded the Catholic Peace Fellowship in 1964 as a more militant, youth-oriented offshoot of the Catholic Worker Movement.
47. “Viet War Foes Heckled Here,” *Pittsburgh Press*, 27 March 1966; “Protest vs. Lawbreaking,” *The Valley Independent* (Charleroi, Pennsylvania), 12 October 1967.
48. Paul Rush letter to Gustave Diamond, U.S. Attorney, 7 December 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23); A. W. Verscharen letter to Charles Rice, 28 April 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Charles Rice letter to A. W. Verscharen, 9 May 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Joseph R. Lawlor letter to John J. Wright, 1 May 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Nelson Graham, letter to John J. Wright, 3 May 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Robert Fries, letter to Charles Rice, 18 April 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Garland B. Neville and Vincent P. Scott, VFW, Brentwood Post 1810, to John Wright, 14 October 1967 (AIS, COR, Box 23).
49. “A Sergeant's Parents,” to the Editor of the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 25 November 1965; Charles Owen Rice, “Draft Card Hysteria,” *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 28 October 1965; Bixler, “‘Labor Priest’ Raps Unions on War.”
50. Sidney Plastrik, “Confrontation in Pittsburgh,” *Dissent* 17 (January-February 1970): 25–31; “Pittsburgh Blacks Try Negotiating,” *Business Week* (6 September 1969): 32–33.
51. Front Page Banner Photograph of Protesting Priests and Sisters, *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 19 September 1969; “Racial Slurs Charged in Church Bulletin,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 25 November 1969;

- "Priests Rip 'Slander' By Church," *Pittsburgh Press*, 24 November 1969; Catholic Interracial Council to St. Mary of Mercy Congregation, 1969 (AIS, CIC, Box 3); St. Mary of Mercy Church, *Bulletin*, 21 September 1969 (AIS, CIC, Box 3); Lawrence Glasco, "Double Burden: The Black Experience in Pittsburgh," in Samuel P. Hays, ed., *City at the Point: Essays on the Social History of Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989), 90; "Labor: Black Battleground," *Time* 94 (5 September 1969): 78; "What Unions Are—And Are Not—Doing for Blacks," *Time* 94 (26 September 1969): 88–89.
52. Charles Owen Rice, "Bias in Building," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 15 August 1969; Charles Owen Rice, "Race and Labor," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 29 August 1969; Charles Owen Rice, "The Demonstrations," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 5 September 1969; Charles Owen Rice, "Construction Talks," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 26 September 1969; Charles Owen Rice, "Police Tactics," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 10 October 1969; "Black Monday Wasn't So Black," *Pittsburgh Point*, 18 September 1969; Charles C. Robb, "The Politicians Meet the Crisis," *Pittsburgh Point*, 18 September 1969; Bodnar, Simon, and Weber, *Lives of Their Own*, 244; Irwin Dubinsky, "Trade Union Discrimination in the Pittsburgh Construction Industry: How and Why it Operates," *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 6 (March 1971): 297–318; Plastrik, "Confrontation in Pittsburgh," 25–31; Mark P. Lapping interview with James McCoy, Civil Rights Coordinator, United Steel Workers' of America District 16, 7 November 1968, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Historical Collection and Labor Archives, Pennsylvania State University (HCLA), Oral History Projects); W. Lee Hooks, Executive Director, Pittsburgh Area Council of Churches, letter to Gerald Kaufman, 1 October 1969 (AIS, Gerald Kaufman Papers, Box 3); Gerald Kaufman, "An Act to Amend the 1955 Pennsylvania Human Relations Act," Draft, 1969 (AIS, Gerald Kaufman Papers, Box 3); "Kaufman Asks State Testing on Craft Jobs," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 27 August 1969; "Pittsburgh Blacks Try Negotiating."
 53. Michael Snow interviews with Peter Flaherty, former mayor of Pittsburgh, 26 February 1999, 30 March 1999, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (AIS, State and Local Government Oral History Project); Thornburgh interview; Richard M. Scammon and Ben J. Wattenberg, *The Real Majority* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1970), 251–55; Charles C. Robb, "One Vote for Flaherty," *Pittsburgh Point*, 15 May 1969; "Pittsburgh: 'Nobody's Boy,'" *Newsweek* 74 (17 November 1969): 49; Carpenters' District Council of Western Pennsylvania, News Release, 16 October 1969 (AIS, John K. Tabor Papers, Box 1); Frank M. Matthews, "Carpenters Come Out for Tabor," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 17 October 1969; John K. Tabor Campaign Letter, 1969 (AIS, John K. Tabor Papers, Box 1).
 54. Scammon and Wattenberg, *The Real Majority*, 251–55; Flaherty interviews; 7/11 Democratic Club, Board Meeting Minutes of 9 April 1969 (AIS, 7/11 Democratic Club Records, Box 1); Thomas A. Hennessy, "Rebuff in Pittsburgh," *The New Republic* 161 (27 September 1969): 16–17; Barbara Ferman, *Challenging the Growth Machine: Neighborhood Politics in Chicago and Pittsburgh* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996), 39; Louise Jezierski, "Neighborhoods and Public-Private Partnerships in Pittsburgh," *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 26 (December 1990): 217–49; Heineman, *A Catholic New Deal*, 172; James P. Gannon, "Last-Hurrah Flavor in Pittsburgh," *Wall Street Journal*, 27 October 1969.
 55. John F. Soboslay letter to the Editor, *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 12 September 1969; A. F. McGervey letter to the Editor, *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 12 September 1969; Phil F. Meade letter to the Editor, *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 12 September 1969; Thomas O'Neil, "Wright Flays Racism in Labor Day Speech,"

- Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 2 September 1969; Stephen Karlinchak, "A Profile of Bishop Leonard in Words, Photos," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 31 May 1985; "Bishop Leonard Dies; Led Diocese Here 14 years," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 29 August 1994.
56. Daniel U. Levine, Norman S. Fiddmont, Robert S. Stephenson, and Charles B. Wilkerson, "Research Note: Are the Black Poor Satisfied with Conditions in Their Neighborhood?" *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 38 (May 1972): 168–71; Ferman, *Challenging the Growth Machine*, 22; Glasco, "Double Burden," 79, 86, 90; County of Allegheny, Official Tabulations of Ballots Cast for all Major Offices, Municipal Elections, Pittsburgh Mayoral Race, 4 November 1969. Flaherty averaged 83 percent of the vote in the Hill District and 80 percent in Polish Hill and Lawrenceville.
57. Charles O. Rice, "The Radical Catholic," *Catholic World* 212 (July 1970): 156–60; Charles Owen Rice, "Re: Kissinger, Russia, Pete," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 11 August 1972; Charles Owen Rice, "Pete's Mistakes," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 16 June 1972; "City Fund Urged in School Integration Effort," *Pittsburgh Press*, 20 December 1972; Charles Rice, "Desegregation Decision," Statement to the Public Hearing of the Pittsburgh School Board, 19 December 1972 (AIS, COR, Box 19). Two additional explanations were, first, that the Pittsburgh data did not draw upon sufficient numbers of youths who might have been more alienated than their elders and, second, the data had been collected before the BCC protests.
58. McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice*, 222–223; Samuel P. Hays, "The Politics of Reform in Municipal Government in the Progressive Era," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 55 (October 1964): 157–69.
59. Holy Rosary Parish Statistics, 1920–1970; McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice*, 189–190.
60. McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice*, 178, 190–191; "Blacks Can't Get Fair Trials Here—Rice," *Pittsburgh Press*, 20 December 1969; Rice, "Bouie Haden's Case"; Charles Owen Rice, "The Billy Hines Case," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 9 October 1969.
61. 1972 Democratic Primary Results in Allegheny County: Hubert Humphrey 86,968; George Wallace, 84,304; George McGovern, 54,179; Edmund Muskie, 41,365; Henry Jackson, 6,912. Byrd Brown, Pittsburgh NAACP President, "Human Rights Dinner Address," 27 April 1972 (AIS, Homer S. Brown Papers, Box 9).
62. Brown, "Human Rights Dinner Address," 27 April 1972; Allegheny County, Official Election Results, Primary Election, Democratic Party, 25 April 1972 9AIS). Curt Miner, "Pennsylvania Sends Them a Message: George Wallace Courts the Keystone State, 1964–1972," Paper Delivered to the Social Science History Association, Chicago, Illinois, November 2001.
63. Rice, "Re: Kissinger, Russia, Pete"; "County Push on for McGovern," *Pittsburgh Press*, 12 December 1971; 7/11 *Club Newsletter*, 6 June 1972 (AIS, 7/11 Democratic Club Records, Box 1).
64. Molly Yard, Citizens for McGovern, Election Analysis of Allegheny County, 1 March 1973 (AIS, Citizens for McGovern Papers, Box 4).
65. 7/11 *Club Newsletter*, December 1972 (AIS, 7/11 Democratic Club Records, Box 1. Election statistics also drawn from, *The Pennsylvania Manual*, 1972–1972, vol. 101 (Harrisburg: Department of Property and Supplies, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1974). In Pittsburgh, 22,135 fewer voters turned out in 1972 than had in 1968. McGovern received 53 percent of the vote in Pittsburgh, compared to Humphrey's 63 percent in 1968.
66. Michael Novak, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), 74–75, 162–63, 166–67, 199; Michael Novak, "Errand into the Wilderness," in,

REFORMATION

- John H. Bunzel, ed., *Political Passages: Journeys of Change Through Two Decades, 1968–1988* (New York: The Free Press, 1988), 239–72.
67. Charles Owen Rice, "The Ethnics," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 29 April 1972; Charles Rice letter and Opinion Piece addressed to Terry Brock of the *National Catholic Reporter*, 8 December 1972 (AIS, COR, Box 23); Greeley, *Building Coalitions*, 217.
 68. James Hitchcock to the Editor, *National Catholic Reporter* 9 (26 January 1973); James Hitchcock, *The Decline and Fall of Radical Catholicism* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1971), 160.
 69. Charles Owen Rice, "The War Goes On. Why?" *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 15 September 1972; Charles Owen Rice, "Women's Plight," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 2 April 1971; Charles Owen Rice, "A Free Press," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 26 June 1970; Charles Owen Rice, "Not the Time for Women Clerics," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 22 September 1972; Charles Owen Rice, "The Divorced Catholic," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 1 December 1972; McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice*, 232–233.
 70. John Golightly, "Abortion Rights Unit Formed," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 11 October 1974; Charles C. Robb, American Civil Liberties Union, Greater Pittsburgh Chapter, Press Release, "Response to Statements by Msgr. Charles Owen Rice and the Rev. Donald McIlvane," 18 October 1974 (AIS, COR, Box 2); Charles Rice and Donald McIlvane, Press Release, "Two Catholic Priests, ACLU Board Members, Denounce anti-Catholic Overtones in Abortion Rights Coalition, Ask ACLU to Disassociate Itself from Efforts to 'Bully' Catholics," 17 October 1974 (AIS, COR, Box 2); Vince Gagetta, "2 ACLU Priests Denounce Bias in Abortion Rhetoric," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 18 October 1974; Charles Owen Rice, "Pro-Abortionists Mounting Counterattack," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 25 October 1974.
 71. Ferman, *Challenging the Growth Machine*, 20; Bryce Nelson, "Pittsburgh Hangs Tough," *Pittsburgh Press*, 29 August 1975; Roy Lubove, *Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh: The Post-Steel Era* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996), 11. For typical Rice analyses of the steel economy, see "Donora Afflicted," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 13 September 1962, "Smoky (?) City," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 27 September 1962, "Steel and the Union," *Pittsburgh Catholic*, 23 August 1968.
 72. McGeever, *Rev. Charles Owen Rice*, 227.

