

Trinity University
Digital Commons @ Trinity

Undergraduate Student Research Awards

Information Literacy Committee

Fall 2017

"Unjust Laws Do Not Bind in Conscience": Archbishop Lucey, Catholic Social Thought, and Civil Rights

Thomas Harvell DeGolier
Trinity University, tharvell@trinity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/infolit_usra

Repository Citation

Harvell DeGolier, Thomas, ""Unjust Laws Do Not Bind in Conscience": Archbishop Lucey, Catholic Social Thought, and Civil Rights" (2017). *Undergraduate Student Research Awards*. 38.
https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/infolit_usra/38

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Information Literacy Committee at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Student Research Awards by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.

**“UNJUST LAWS DO NOT BIND IN CONSCIENCE”: ARCHBISHOP LUCEY, CATHOLIC
SOCIAL THOUGHT, AND CIVIL RIGHTS**

By: Thomas Harvell-DeGolier

Introduction

Following the March on Selma, a pinnacle moment in America's civil rights era, the Archbishop of San Antonio, Robert E. Lucey penned a letter to the Reverend Claude William Black.¹ In his letter, the Archbishop expressed indignation towards Alabama's treatment of peaceful protesters.² Lucey wrote that "in Selma, the State troopers instead of protecting the rights of the colored marchers attacked them and wounded them.... any citizen has a right to walk peacefully in defense of justice."³ Following this, Lucey lacerated those who framed their opposition to the march on its lack of legality, stating that while "religion [protected] the civil authority against treason," it simultaneously protected individuals from the predations of unjust laws.⁴

Lucey asserted that unjust laws did not bind civil rights activists and that they maintained the right to protest those laws. Lucey's belief that "unjust laws [did] not bind in conscience" mirrored Catholic social teachings.⁵ This belief reflected ideas in Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (1891), which argued that only laws in accordance with the "eternal law of God" bound mankind.⁶ As such, Lucey's beliefs followed a Catholic social tradition encouraging opposition to unjust societal structures. To Lucey, Alabama's response to Selma, and the Jim Crow system, contradicted God's laws, thus compelling the marchers to "join associations among themselves [to] courageously shake off the yoke of an unjust and intolerable

¹ Claude Black was the African-American pastor of the historically Black Mt. Zion Baptist Church in San Antonio.

² Robert Lucey, "Letter from Robert E. Lucey to Claude W. Black," letter, March 12, 1965, Series 8, Scrapbooks, Claude and Zernona Black Papers, Trinity University Special Collections.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Leo XII, "Rerum Novarum: The Conditions of Labor," in *Catholic Social Thought: A Documentary History*, ed. David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 34.

oppression.”⁷ Lucey’s statement that religion “protects the citizen against tyranny” and that “in Alabama there [was] tyranny and colored citizens [had] an obligation to stand up and defend their rights” utilized Leo XIII’s language to defend the actions of civil rights activists.⁸

Labelling Alabama as an unjust tyranny which abrogated the rights of black citizens permitted Lucey to invoke *Rerum Novarum*’s assertion that “rights must be religiously respected wherever they are found and it [was] the duty of the public authority to prevent and punish injury, and to protect each one in the possession of his own.”⁹ While this encyclical initially argued a middle path between capitalism and socialism, Robert Lucey transferred the encyclicals’ message of human dignity to the civil rights struggle by stressing the state’s duty to protect all its citizens.

Furthermore, the letter from Lucey to Claude Black revealed ecumenical cooperation between San Antonio’s Archdiocese and other religious groups in San Antonio.¹⁰ This multi-faith coalition was the product of organizational and government pressures to decrease inter-faith discrimination between Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, an effort whose language and rhetoric easily shifted to attack racial injustice.¹¹ By corresponding with Claude Black and Rabbi David Jacobson, of Beth-El San Antonio, Lucey placed himself firmly within San Antonio’s religious coalition against Jim Crow.¹² However, while Lucey often involved himself with other religious

⁷ Ibid, 35.

⁸ Lucey, “Letter from Robert E. Lucey to Claude W. Black.”

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ John Moreland, *Lunch-Counter Desegregation in Corpus Christi, Galveston, and San Antonio* (Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Council, 1960).60. Frederic Bruton, “Desegregation in San Antonio” (Trinity University, 1969); Robert Goldberg, “Racial Change on the Southern Periphery: The Case of San Antonio, Texas, 1960-1965,” *The Journal of Southern History* 49, no. 3 (1983): 349–74.

¹¹ Kevin Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011) 179-197.

¹² 6/5/2019 6:43:00 PM; David Jacobson, “David Jacobson to Robert E. Lucey, August 20, 1965,” August 20, 1965, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA; Robert Lucey, “Letter from Robert E. Lucey to David Jacobson, October 22nd, 1957,” letter, October 22, 1957, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA; Robert Lucey, “Letter from Robert E Lucey to David Jacobson, August 23, 1965,” letter, August 23, 1965, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

leaders, his intellectual heritage created a unique Catholic civil rights advocacy. This intellectual legacy led Lucey to support civil rights in Texas from the 1930s onward when most of the Southern Catholic hierarchy comfortably participated in the Jim Crow South.¹³

This article explores how Catholic social thought influenced Robert E. Lucey's civil rights advocacy and connects Lucey's civil rights advocacy to Catholic social thought. To do this, the paper chronologically examines Lucey's career while contextualizing it through the emergence of Catholic social thought in America, and the racial and religious climates of the American South. In doing so, the paper will show how Lucey's embrace of Catholic social teachings and application of them represented a break from how the Catholic Church had operated in the American South. This will show that a catholic opposition to Jim Crow originated before the 1960s, and emerged from intellectual foundations established in the 1890s and 1930s.

Emergence of Catholic Social Teachings in America

While societal pressures and racial attitudes in the South kept Catholics either silent about, or complicit in, Southern racial and economic inequalities, a strain of Catholic thought stressing economic and racial justice emerged in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The economic justice movement originated out of Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum*, and Pius XI's *Quadregesimo Anno* (1931). These encyclicals attempted to forge a middle-path between capitalist degradations and socialism, and inspired many Catholics, such as Robert E. Lucey, to vociferously defend FDR's New Deal as well as other programs that helped the poor and benighted members of society, despite pushback from inside and outside the Church.

¹³ In advancing the argument that Lucey's engagement with civil rights spanned from the 1930s-1950s, this paper also rejects the claim Brian Behnken makes that Lucey was a Civil Rights moderate. See Brian Behnken, *Fighting Their Own Battles: Mexican Americans, African Americans, and the Struggle for Civil Rights* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 102-106.

On racial issues, the Catholic movement towards interracialism and racial justice began following the end of the First World War with Pius XI's *Rerum Ecclesiae*, which implied that viewing non-Anglos as inferior was a "grievous mistake" and bemoaned the lack of "indigenous clergy."¹⁴ This message reflected Pius XI's growing concern with the wellbeing and representation of minorities in the Catholic Church, alongside a growing belief among the Catholic hierarchy that ideas of racial superiority were incompatible with the Catholic faith.¹⁵ As such, Pius XI provided an intellectual background to oppose racial discrimination. This background provided the foundations for Lucey's future advocacy, by strengthening a notion of equality rooted in the belief that all men were created equal in God's image.¹⁶

This revolution in thought, according to John T. McGreevy, linked itself with a Thomistic philosophy encouraged by Leo XIII that focused on a unity and wholeness of the Catholic Church.¹⁷ This belief system made racial discrimination and segregation incompatible with the church, because it ruined the wholeness of God's people and, as such "Jim Crowism in the Mystical Body of Christ [was] a disgraceful anomaly."¹⁸ This idea of Jim Crow as a disgrace the conception of a universal brotherhood under God, Pius XI's call for both "Valiant soldiers of Christ, who [strained] every thew and sinew to preserve the human family," and the training of lay apostles to oppose "unjust claims and unjust Actions," laid the groundwork for Catholic support of the civil rights movement.¹⁹ In the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, a young priest named

¹⁴John T. McGreevy, *Parish Boundries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 9.

¹⁵ Ibid, 50-51.

¹⁶McGreevy, 38-47;R. Bentley Anderson, *Black, White, and Catholic: New Orleans Interracialism, 1947-1956* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005), 1.

¹⁷McGreevy, *Parish Boundries*, 41-43.

¹⁸Ibid, 41-45.

¹⁹ Pius XI, "Quadregesimo Anno: After Forty Years," in *Catholic Social Thought: A Documentary Heritage*, ed. David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 78-79.

Robert E. Lucey was influenced by these traditions of economic and racial justice and their inherent call to action.

A Priest in Los Angeles

Before his appointment in Amarillo, Lucey made a name for himself as a champion of social justice while directing the Los Angeles branch of Catholic Charities, which, under his direction, moved from focusing treating symptoms of societal inequalities to treating its causes.²⁰ Influenced by Father John Ryan, whose interpretation of Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* demanded that workers be paid living wages, Lucey decried labor injustices in Los Angeles, a bastion of anti-unionism, and called for the implementation of a living wage.²¹ Likewise, Lucey would also be influenced by Pius XI's *Quadregesimo Anno*. *Quadregesimo Anno*, while likely in the works long before 1929, was released two years after the 1929 stock market crash—and decried corporate greed, the lack of regulations to restrain this greed, while endorsing an “insistence on the moral law, enforced with vigor by civil authority... [to dispel] ...these enormous evils.”²² This, in Lucey's mind, justified calls to reform society into one that would serve the poor and mistreated. Lucey, influenced by this encyclical, advocated for increased government involvement in the economy, a strengthening of unions and a general reordering of society's structure.²³

Moreover, Lucey followed another of the encyclical's dictates and urged clergy to “establish study clubs [...] to learn through informal discussion the meaning of Catholic social

²⁰ Saul Bronder, *Social Justice and Church Authority: The Public Life of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1982), 24-26.

²¹ Ibid; Robert Lucey, Oral Memoirs of The Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, interview by H. Wayne Pipkin and Thomas L. Charlton, 72 1971, Baylor Oral History Institute, Baylor University, 1971-72.

²² Pius XI, “Catholic Social Thought,” 74-75.

²³ Bronder, *Social Justice and Church Authority: The Public Life of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey*, 33-38.

teaching.”²⁴ This emphasis on educating priests and laity to spread Catholic social teachings remained with Lucey throughout his episcopal tenure. This focus on spreading Catholic social teachings, thus educating the laity with the intellectual basis for Catholic support for labor, racial and economic justice, animated Lucey and he consistently stressed spreading these teachings. This fervor caught the eye of the Roman Catholic hierarchy who recommended Lucey appointment to the Bishopric of Amarillo.²⁵ However, local white Catholic attitudes towards the Church’s social teachings, and the nature of Catholicism in the South were tied to the south’s racial and Jim Crow culture, making it less hospitable to Lucey’s brand of Catholicism.

Catholicism in The South and Texas

Catholicism had existed in the American South since the Spanish colonized Florida and Texas.²⁶ By the antebellum period, Catholics made up a “relatively small minority” but were a significant population in the South’s larger cities such as New Orleans, Charleston, Louisville and Mobile.²⁷ In these areas, Catholics aligned with, and adapted themselves to, a Southern culture that argued that slavery was moral.²⁸ Indeed, adopting anti-abolitionist rhetoric, conservative Southern Catholic leaders railed against abolitionists decrying them as “fanatical zealots,” and declared that slavery followed God’s divine will and argued that slaves would not prepared for freedom.²⁹ Essentially, Southern Catholicism grafted itself onto existing social structures, while members of the Southern Catholic hierarchy maintained close relationship with rich slave-owning confederates.³⁰ Thus, in the American South, racial prejudices superseded

²⁴Ibid, 75-76; N.C.W.C. News Service, “Labor Encyclical’s Teachings Studied at Priest’s Session,” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, May 22, 1935, The Catholic News Archive.

²⁵“Labor Encyclical’s Teachings Studied at Priest’s Session,” 39.

²⁶ Paul Harvey, *Christianity and Race in the American South: A History* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2016) 9.

²⁷ Ibid, 82.

²⁸ Ibid, 82-84.

²⁹ Ibid, 82-84:96:103.

³⁰ Harvey, *Christianity, and Race*, 82-84.

religious tensions between Catholics and Protestants. As such, white Catholics, much like their Protestant brethren still discriminated against African-Americans.

Following the end of the Civil War and Reconstruction, despite America's "new birth of freedom," Jim Crow began and the Catholic hierarchy again adapted themselves to a system that discriminated against African-Americans.³¹ This showed how Southern Catholicism subsumed itself into the broader racial image of the American South.³² Essentially, while the Catholic Church tried to promote itself as "one Church that did not discriminate," the Catholic Church did, in fact, discriminate.³³

During the late nineteenth Century, American Catholics—especially Irish-Americans—adopted nativists attitudes towards immigrants and non-white Americans to prove that Catholics were fully American.³⁴ Despite attempts to fit within the South's racial hierarchy, many southern evangelical Protestants remained distrustful of Catholic intentions.³⁵ Indeed, the second incarnation of the KKK directed its ire towards Catholics, specifically the Knights of Columbus and the Jesuits—groups viewed as being disloyal to America.³⁶ The perception that Catholics were disloyal and subservient to a foreign king was prominent in American life, and Protestants often accused Catholics "of not supporting freedom of religion, and of being anti-democratic, mysterious, secretive, and opposed to the Bible."³⁷ The conception of Catholic disloyalty remained persistent, meaning many Catholics felt they needed to prove their loyalty.

³¹ Ibid, 114-115, 124-125; James B. Bennet, *Religion, and the Rise of Jim Crow in New Orleans* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 160-192.

³² Harvey, *Christianity and Race in the American South: A History*, 124.

³³ Ibid, 125.

³⁴ William Cossen, "Catholic Gatekeepers: The Church and Immigration Reform In the Gilded Age and Progressive Era," *U.S Catholic Historian* 34, no. 3 (2016): 1-23.

³⁵ Andrew Moore, *The South's Tolerable Alien: Roman Catholics in Alabama and Georgia 1945-1970* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2007), 32.

³⁶ Ibid; For more on the KKK's anti-Catholic nature see: Kelly J. Baker, *The Gospel According to the Klan: The KKK's Appeal to Protestant America, 1915-1930* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2011).

³⁷ Moore, *The South's Tolerable Alien*, 35.

Despite the efforts of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ) to rein in religious discrimination, it persisted.³⁸ Indeed, in 1959, a retired Army Brigadier General, Herbert C. Holdridge, wrote a letter to president Eisenhower concerning the Jesuits, which he copied to various other figures, including Lyndon Baines Johnson, the Senate Majority Leader at the time.³⁹ In this letter, Holdridge described the Jesuit order as “Shock troops” that subverted “schools, [the] press, [the] radio,” and who infiltrated “public office and [...] the armed forces.”⁴⁰ Holdridge’s solution to the problem involved arresting every Jesuit, dissolving all Catholic orders, isolating the Vatican, closing Catholic schools, and revoking the citizenship of Catholics who “[refused] to recant on loyalties to the Jesuits.”⁴¹ This did not happen. However, it showed that anti-Catholic beliefs remained present.

Prominent Catholics knew they needed to refute perceptions that Catholics opposed the American democratic experiment. In 1948, Archbishop Robert E. Lucey wrote in *Christianity and Crisis* that “no responsible Catholic [desired] any change in the formula worked out by the founding fathers of our country to regulate relations between church and state” and that “under circumstances existing in our country [Catholics desired] exactly what [they had] and [Catholics] demand that no change be made.”⁴² This argued that Catholics and the Catholic Church were compatible with, not hostile towards, the American democratic ideal. Essentially, Catholics were content with America’s form of Government.

Likewise, when John F. Kennedy ran for president he stated that, as a Catholic and American he was “wholly opposed to the state being used by any religious group, Catholic or

³⁸ Moore.

³⁹ Moore.; Herbert Holdridge, “Herbert C. Holdridge to Dwight Eisenhower Concerning the Pope’s Commandos,” Letter, January 18, 1959, LBJ Senate Papers 1947-1961, Office Files of George Reedy, Box 427, Reedy: Hate Sheets, Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, and Archives.

⁴⁰ Holdridge, “Herbert C. Holdridge to Dwight Eisenhower Concerning the Pope’s Commandos.”

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

Protestant, to compel, prohibit, or persecute the free exercise of any other religion.”⁴³ This speech emphasized that Catholics embraced America’s Religious freedom and did not threaten freedom of conscience or the independence of the American government. Moreover, the continuing pressure to prove their Americanness kept the Southern Catholic hierarchy silent on racial issues in the American South until the 1950s and 1960s.⁴⁴ This situation made Lucey’s earlier advocacy for civil rights unique.

The New Dealing Bishop on the Llano Estacado

During his time as the Bishop of Amarillo, a position he assumed in 1934, Lucey obtained a reputation as an authoritarian who wanted to control “ne’er-do-well [priests] who [seemed] to take pleasure in opposing their bishop.”⁴⁵ This desire to maintain absolute authority within the Church was one of Lucey’s primary characteristics. Lucey used this authoritarianism to spread Catholic social teachings and support F.D.R.’s New Deal. Indeed, Lucey, during his time in Amarillo, gained a reputation as a New Dealing Bishop.⁴⁶ This stemmed from his support for the CIO, despite the hostility most Catholic clergy held toward this labor organization, and Roosevelt’s Court packing scheme, which much of America’s Catholic hierarchy also opposed. Lucey’s support for F.D.R and his New Deal based itself on Lucey’s staunch advocacy of the Catholic social teachings in *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadregesimo Anno*, whose essential arguments supported F.D.R’s programs.⁴⁷ Accordingly, at the end of his tenure as the Bishop of Amarillo, Lucey was known as “the most socially conscious New Dealer in the Roman Catholic

⁴³ John F. Kennedy, “September 12, 1960: Address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association,” available from: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/september-12-1960-address-greater-houston-ministerial>. (accessed: 9 December 2017).

⁴⁴ Moore.

⁴⁵ As an aside, when Lucey was assigned to be the Bishop of Amarillo he asked himself “Where the hell is Amarillo?”; Bronder, *Social Justice and Church Authority: The Public Life of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey*, 46.

⁴⁶ Bronder.

⁴⁷ *ibid*, 53-60.

hierarchy.”⁴⁸ The presence of this New Dealing Bishop in Texas was, to say the least incongruous. Texas, despite supporting Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was—according to sociologist Robert Wuthnow—relatively wary of government intrusion into labor and business affairs, due to the state’s religiously influenced belief in self-sufficiency.⁴⁹

As Bishop of Amarillo, Lucey noticed Hispanic Catholic poverty and viewed their poverty as evidence that they were “the victims of an atrocious economic system,” a stark contrast to a fellow bishops who stated Hispanics “[did] not look upon [themselves] as belonging to an inferior race.”⁵⁰ Unlike many of his peers, Lucey did not view minorities as backwards or uncivilized; rather, he saw them the victims of a discriminatory system.⁵¹ This emphasis on the low wages that were being offered to Mexican laborers showed that Lucey had begun applying the ideas of *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadrogesimo Anno* to the plight of the Mexican workers.

Later in his career, Lucey noted that, despite Irish claims that they maintained a superior form of Catholicism, Mexican Catholicism had resided in the Americas before the Irish arrived and that an Irishman would likely not work hard if paid 40 cents an hour like many of the Mexican, and Mexican-American laborers.⁵² Due to his experiences in Amarillo and San Antonio, Lucey developed an appreciation for the work ethic of Mexican workers. This sympathy towards immigrant and migrant workers set Lucey apart from many of his fellow Irish-

⁴⁸ “New Dealing Archbishop,” *Time*, April 7, 1941.

⁴⁹ Robert Wuthnow, *Rough Country: How Texas Became America's Most Powerful Bible-Belt State* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014).196.

⁵⁰ American Board of Catholic Missions report (hereafter referred to as ABCM), 1932-33, Report from the Archdiocese of San Antonio, quoted in Stephen A. Privett, *The U.S. Catholic Church and Its Hispanic Members: The Pastoral Vision of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey*, (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1988); ABCM, 1928-29, Archdiocese of Denver Quoted in Privett “The U.S. Catholic Church and its Hispanic Members.”

⁵¹ Privett, “The U.S Catholic Church and its Hispanic Members” 11-12.

⁵² Robert Lucey, “Justice for Mexicans,” *Commonweal*, November 12, 1948, 117. In Privett.

American Catholics, whose assimilation into American society included erecting barriers between Americanized Catholics and newer migrant Catholic communities.⁵³

During Lucey's tenure as the Bishop of Amarillo, he connected his views on racial equality with Catholic social teachings. During a speech to the American Federation of labor, "Lucey [citing] dog-eat-dog competition in business as [a] defect of the economic system [...] urged that Negro and Mexican laborers be organized," while calling for workers to band together and pressure the government to support labor friendly legislation.⁵⁴ This specific call for unions to organize black and Mexican laborers reflected a connection between the rights of minorities and the rights of labor, showing that Lucey emphasized intersectional solidarity against unjust economic systems.

Although Lucey urged the organization of minority laborers with the qualifier that it prevented growers from using Mexicans and African-Americans as strikebreakers, he argued for them to be organized nonetheless. Essentially, he targeted his argument towards white union members, because preventing strikebreaking, by forming interracial unions had the potential to raise wages across the board. Furthermore, the emphasis on the right of Mexican and African-Americans farmworkers to collectively bargain invoked the arguments in *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadrogesimo Anno* that workers had the right to organize and throw off oppression's yoke.⁵⁵

The dichotomy between Lucey at the time of his appointment and the then-extant Catholic hierarchy in Texas, revealed the Church's newer social teachings influenced Lucey more than the other Texas bishops, who were more conservative and having adapted to the racism of the American South, and southwest, were less inclined to challenge this status quo.

⁵³ Cossen, 23.

⁵⁴ N.C.W.C. News Service, "Bishop Lucey Wildy Applauded as He Addresses Labor Federation," *N.C.W.C. News Service*, May 7, 1940, The Catholic News Archive.

⁵⁵ Leo XII.; Pius XI.

However, Lucey's belief that the "Catholic Church as the interpreter of natural law, [was] the defender of human rights," and that "God created the earth and its wealth for all his children" made this go-and-get-along mentality unconscionable, and, as such, he failed to settle into the racial and labor status quo in Texas.⁵⁶

Civil and Labor Rights in San Antonio Before Lucey's Arrival

San Antonio was established as a military post in 1689 and from its origins maintained a reputation as a racially mixed city.⁵⁷ Before the Civil War, San Antonio's paternalistic racial structure created a tiered system with Anglos at the top, and Tejanos in the middle and African slaves at the bottom.⁵⁸ In the post-antebellum period, the traditional racial hierarchy reestablished itself and San Antonio segregated itself by forcing different ethnicities and groups to form separate enclaves within the city.⁵⁹ Initially, this law only included African-Americans. However, over time, it grew to include Mexican American residents of San Antonio.⁶⁰

The continuing paternalistic nature of San Antonio, and the reluctance of white San Antonians to share true economic freedom with formerly enslaved persons limited job opportunities to "negro work" for the freemen, which, for men was primarily menial labor and, for women, domestic labor.⁶¹ Furthermore, by the 1920s, increased Mexican migration allowed white businessmen to lower wages for both Mexican-American and African-Americans by

⁵⁶ N.C.W.C. News Service, "Church Defender of Human Rights Bishop Declares," *N.C.W.C. News Service*, December 9, 1940, The Catholic News Archive.

⁵⁷ The actual founding date of San Antonio is disputed based on different events that could be considered its founding. Kenneth Mason, *African Americans and Race Relations in San Antonio, Texas, 1867-1937* (New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc., 1998), 3-14.

⁵⁸ *ibid.*

⁵⁹ *ibid.*, 23-43.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*; Cynthia Orozco, *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed: The Rise of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2009) 29.

⁶¹ Mason, *African Americans and Race Relations in San Antonio, Texas, 1867-1937*, 51-53.; Orozco, *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed*, 23.

pitting these groups against each other to undercut their respective demands for higher wages.⁶² Moreover, unions often proved little help because of their often racist leadership.⁶³

The Catholic Church in San Antonio neglected Catholic social teachings and did not support policies that assisted the Mexican and African-American members of its parishes. The Archdiocese of San Antonio failed to oppose the segregation of San Antonio's educational facilities and established segregated schools and congregations. As such, according to Kenneth Mason, San Antonio's Catholic Church went along with the San Antonio's discriminatory societal structures.⁶⁴ Accordingly, San Antonio's Catholic hierarchy, before Lucey's arrival, maintained racial attitudes like those held by Catholics throughout the south, ambivalent towards civil rights and enmeshed within an existing racial hierarchy.⁶⁵ Racially, San Antonio was a thoroughly Southern city.⁶⁶

The tri-racial system in San Antonio contributed to the Catholic culture of the city, by allowing the Catholic Church to be less supportive of the Mexican Americans who labored at the bottom of San Antonio society, while it allied itself with those in power. This lack of concern towards the San Antonio diocese's Hispanic congregation in the 1930s laid itself bare through Droessarts handling of the 1938 Pecan-Sheller's strike. These workers were primarily young Mexican and Tejano women and were exposed to horrid conditions, and, under Emma Tenayuca's leadership, organized to improve their conditions.⁶⁷ However, Droessarts was deeply anti-communist, and Tenayuca's communist sympathies led Droessarts to oppose the strike

⁶² Mason, 59-61.

⁶³ *ibid.*

⁶⁴ Mason, *African Americans and Race Relations in San Antonio, Texas, 1867-1937*, 142-150.

⁶⁵ Harvey.

⁶⁶ Bruton, "Desegregation in San Antonio," 4.

⁶⁷ Arlene Sánchez-Walsh, "Emma Tenayuca, Religious Elites, and the 1938 Pecan Sheller's Strike," in *The Pew and the Picket Line: Christianity and the American Working Class* (Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2016) 147.

despite Catholic social teachings that supported labor organizing against unjust economic conditions.⁶⁸ Droessarts' belief that Mexican Catholics— alongside his conviction that communism was evil—needed paternalistic guidance influenced his opposition to Tenayuca's movement.⁶⁹ This racial paternalism led Droessarts to rail against Tenayuca and her movement, while he neglected Pius XI's *Anno Quadregesimo*.⁷⁰ Rather than support his parishioners, Droessart tried to dominate his congregation's religious expression and ignored their material well-being.

From Droessarts' lack of involvement in the Pecan Sheller's strike, it became apparent that Lucey's advocacy for Mexican workers differed from other Texas bishops who were stringently anti-union, anti-communist, and believed that child labor should be an issue left to states and not the federal government.⁷¹ As such, Droessarts represented a conservative Catholic hierarchy that bended to local pressures, whereas Lucey's views placed his intellectual and moral integrity ahead of local concerns. Much like his other positions, Lucey's support for the banning of child labor based itself in the social encyclicals by Leo XIII and Pius XI.⁷²

Droessarts' concern with the purely spiritual wellbeing of Hispanic Catholics versus Lucey's concern with their holistic wellbeing showed how Catholic social teachings allowed Lucey— who realized that man's spiritual and physical needs were worthy of the Church's attention—to diverge from the positions held by other Texas bishops. This became starkly apparent through positions Lucey and Droessarts took on a bill banning child labor. Lucey supported banning child labor, whereas Droessarts held that the state should be the final

⁶⁸ *ibid*, 164.

⁶⁹ Stephen Privett, "Robert E. Lucey: Evangelization and Catechist among Hispanic Catholics" (The Catholic University of America, 1985) 25.

⁷⁰ Arlene Sánchez-Walsh, "Emma Tenayuca, Religious Elites, and the 1938 Pecan Sheller's Strike," 154-160.

⁷¹ N.C.W.C. News Service, "Texas Prelate's Views on Child Labor," *N.C.W.C. News Service*, February 27, 1937, The Catholic News Archive.

⁷² Leo XII, "Rerum Novarum," 31.

arbitrator, thus ceding questions of societal morality to the state and not the church.⁷³ This showed that Droessarts was more inclined to go along with prevailing social and political norms of Texas, whereas Lucey, drawing on Catholic social teachings, bucked the conservative Texas hierarchy's consensus on labor rights. The dichotomy between these two bishops did not last long, however. In late 1940 Droessarts died, and Lucey replaced him as the Archbishop of San Antonio.⁷⁴

Lucey's Arrival in San Antonio

Lucey's appointment was well received by San Antonio, whose mayor, Maury Maverick Sr. wrote Lucey that "[his] appointment [was] the greatest single fortunate occurrence for San Antonio in a very, very long time" and whose newspaper, the San Antonio Express, lavished praise on the new Archbishop's social work-infused record.⁷⁵ Reflecting his national notoriety, Lucey also received a letter from Franklin Roosevelt that offered the president's personal congratulations.⁷⁶ This reception showed that Lucey's reputation had gathered him acclaim both nationally and within the state of Texas.

The arrival of Archbishop Lucey in San Antonio drastically changed the Archdiocese's policy towards racial and social rights. While Droessarts failed to focus on Catholic social teachings, Lucey emphasized them. As such, it would be reasonable to assume that Lucey would supported Tenayuca and the Pecan-Sheller's strike, if not Tenayuca herself, due to his social justice record.⁷⁷

⁷³ N.C.W.C. News Service, "Texas Prelate's Views on Child Labor."

⁷⁴ Bronder, 65.

⁷⁵ N.C.W.C. News Service, "'San Antonio Paper Pays Glowing Tribute To Archbishop Lucey,'" *N.C.W.C. News Service*, February 3, 1941, The Catholic News Archive.; N.C.W.C. News Service, "City Auditorium Offered in Connection With The Archbishop's Installation," *N.C.W.C. News Service*, February 3, 1941, The Catholic News Archive.

⁷⁶ N.C.W.C. News Service, "4-Day Celebration at Installation of Archbishop Lucey," *N.C.W.C. News Service*, March 31, 1941, The Catholic News Archive.

⁷⁷ Arlene Sánchez-Walsh, "Emma Tenayuca, Religious Elites, and the 1938 Pecan Sheller's Strike," 164.

After his appointment, Lucey—while advocating for the Pecan Shellers to receive a pay raise—came into contact with a young Congressman named Lyndon Johnson.⁷⁸ Lucey’s advocacy had, according to Congressman Johnson’s recollection, led many Texans to believe that Lucey was a Bolshevik, due to his bold advocacy for social and economic justice.⁷⁹ This specific instance revealed that Lucey’s vigorous advocacy for the wellbeing of his non-white parishoners had garnered him notoriety among Texas’ broader population.

Accordingly, when appointed to the more populous and less dustbowl inflicted episcopacy of San Antonio, Lucey did not lose a new dealin’ minute and stepped up to the plate, attacking both San Antonio’s inequities and national inequities. Lucey exemplified this when, only two weeks after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, he proclaimed:

In the richest country in the world one-third of our citizens live in poverty and squalor. Sometimes we pay wages not according to human needs and social justice but according to the color of a man’s skin. And sometimes we despise the man whose color is brown or black even though he is a child of God and a good American. Can we continue to abuse the spirit of democracy and claim to be worthy of it?⁸⁰

Essentially, Lucey held that, despite American attempts to assume moral superiority against the Axis Powers, the continued racism towards, and poverty of, America’s nonwhite citizens rendered this claim disingenuous. To the Archbishop, a country that discriminated against a child of god, who was a good American, could not claim to be morally superior. This criticism, coming two weeks after Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor thrust the United States into war, was striking. Despite following Roosevelt as a New Dealer, Lucey used his authority to call out inequities of American society rather than letting Jim Crow lie unchallenged. Lucey’s belief in

⁷⁸ Robert Lucey, Robert Lucey Oral History, Interview I, interview by Dorothy Pierce, October 19, 1968, Oral History Collection, Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

⁷⁹ Stephen Privett, “Robert E. Lucey: Evangelization and Catchesis among Hispanic Catholics” 45.

⁸⁰ Robert Lucey, “Patriotic Meeting” (Memorial Stadium, Austin, TX, December 21, 1941), Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

civil rights sprung from his faith; indeed, the archbishop attested that the Lord, by instructing his disciples to love one another, made love towards one's fellow man, regardless of race, a key requirement of being Christian.⁸¹ Thus Lucey's willingness to criticize American society sprung from his religious beliefs.

Lucey's views on racial equality, and vision of America as a land of racial equality, had shifted his ardent support of FDR. Indeed, Lucey's strongly pro-Roosevelt position made his willingness to rebuke American society during the Roosevelt administration striking. This more nuanced position reflected Lucey's realization that, despite the gains by many white workers during the great depression, the New Deal's benefits were unequally spread and that Mexican, and African Americans did not get their fair shake in society.

Jeremiads against Jim Crow

With both Hispanic and African Americans facing discrimination, Lucey's believed that, in order to fulfill his religious and ecclesiastical goal to improve his congregants' spiritual life, he needed to advocate for their material wellbeing. Lucey realized that Jim Crow harmed spiritual expression by stripping away the ability for non-white groups to fully participate in society. Indeed, the widespread discrimination against African-Americans led Lucey to inquire, "where are the joy and gladness of a life clouded with discrimination, legal restrictions, and all the taboos and hatreds of racial injustice?"⁸² Lucey's question revealed that he viewed Jim Crow to be an immoral system that stripped the joy from life and left African-Americans bereft of spiritual comfort and "made a mockery of happiness."⁸³ This re-centered Lucey's opposition to Jim Crow firmly within a sense of disgust at the material and spiritual indignities of Jim Crow.

⁸¹ Lucey, *Oral Memoirs of The Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey*, 4.

⁸² Robert Lucey, "Excerpts from Lucey's Address to the Southwest Regional Conference of Catholic Women" October 4, 1949, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

⁸³ *ibid.*

Essentially, Jim Crow was unconscionable and ungodly and necessitated opposition on moral grounds because to deprive someone of the joy of God's creation was cruel and immoral.

This distaste towards oppressive bigotry manifested itself throughout Lucey's tenure. Indeed, Lucey's speeches drew stylistically from the tradition of the jeremiad. The American jeremiad, as defined by historian David Howard-Pitney, invoked both America's sacred nature and pride in its history, while also inveighing against America's unjust society.⁸⁴ Lucey exhorted America's "Pioneer Statesman, whom he called "Christians, holding the belief that all men are brothers in the fatherhood of God," while attacking their descendants who had failed to push for universal equality and thus betrayed America's founding ideals.⁸⁵ As such, Lucey maintained that while America initially possessed God's divine favor, America's immoral actions caused it to fall from grace.

Expanding upon this criticism, Lucey stated that, "many of [our] citizens still believe in the idea of the master race, they feel that the man whose skin is brown or black is... inferior... apparently, all men are created equal if their skin is white. As though Almighty God were concerned with pigmentation!"⁸⁶ In this statement, Lucey reprimanded those that believed in white supremacy and proclaimed that God is above the petty distinctions of skin tone, thus emphasizing the equality of all men before God.

In 1947, Lucey proclaimed that Christians who live "in the light of the sun" while ignoring their neighbors, followed the path to ruin.⁸⁷ Essentially, America's discrimination harmed the nation and citizens who ignored this reality endangered their immortal souls. In a

⁸⁴ David Howard-Pitney, *The African-American Jeremiad: Appeals for Justice in America* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2005), 3-12.

⁸⁵ Robert Lucey, "Sermon From Robert E. Lucey" March 18, 1943, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

⁸⁶ *ibid.*

⁸⁷ N.C.W.C. News Service, "A Real Christian Truly Is His Brother's Keeper, Archbishop Tells Charity Meeting," *N.C.W.C. News Service*, October 13, 1947, The Catholic News Archive.

sense, despite the berating nature of the speech, Lucey maintained the implicit message that one should repent and leave the path of white supremacy before it destroyed one's soul.

Lucey berated these apathetic Catholics because he viewed his social justice advocacy as a crusade and, often stated that it was, "a time for high heroism and deep devotion."⁸⁸ This crusading zeal and call to action mirrored *Quadregesimo Anno*, which emphasized the need for Catholics to take upon "the good and peaceful fight of Christ, as far as talents, powers, and station allow" to spread Christ's kingdom on earth.⁸⁹ This idea that Lucey and other prelates should use everything their position provides them to spread God's kingdom inherently required the recruitment of Christian soldiers to spread this kingdom. As such, Lucey willingly shamed racism and segregation's white Southern Catholic proponents. Specifically, Lucey criticized Catholics who endorsed segregated schooling.⁹⁰ Lucey called segregation a sin against both charity and justice and pointed out that, "in the divine plan of redemption," a child's color made no difference.⁹¹ Lucey thus painted segregation as antithetical to Christian belief and pointed out the inherent hypocrisies of people trying to prevent school integration while professing Catholic beliefs. For Lucey, Segregation and Catholicism were incompatible.

Expanding upon this, Lucey, addressing Xavier University, criticized ignorance or dismissal of Catholic social teachings among the white laity, who, despite their alleged Catholicism, had "ignored or never [known] the social teachings of their religion," and, as such, did not deserve to be called Christian.⁹² This specific criticism revealed that Lucey viewed Catholic social teachings as essential to Catholicism. Lucey criticized the Catholic Church,

⁸⁸ "Robert Lucey, "Excerpts from Sermon by Lucey in Observation of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of Xavier University for Negro Youth" October 12, 1950, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

⁸⁹ Pius XI, 80.

⁹⁰ Lucey, "Excerpts from Lucey's Address to the Southwest Regional Conference of Catholic Women."

⁹¹ *ibid.*

⁹² Lucey, "Excerpts from Sermon By Lucey in Observation of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of Xavier University for Negro Youth."

saying it “had been complacent” against the evils of the world, specifically white supremacy, and stated that, carrying “the armor of God,” Catholics would now stand up to the evil of white supremacy.⁹³ This concept, while rhetorically sound, was not factually accurate; for example, Bishop Toolen, of Mobile Alabama, for instance, did not desegregate Alabama parochial schools until 1964.⁹⁴ However, by making this promise at Xavier University, an institution founded to teach black Catholics, Lucey sent a message that he stood with African-American Catholics, not Catholics who professed the “unchristian stupidity of... white supremacy.”⁹⁵ This assured these young African-American Catholics that, in their struggle against the South’s racial hierarchy, part of the institutional church backed them.

Lucey’s embrace of oppressed racial groups existed alongside his conviction that Catholicism’s social justice teachings were as important as its religious doctrine. As such, Lucey disdained professed Catholics who discriminated against people based on skin tone, or who were, in the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., white moderates that did nothing to further the cause of universal equality.⁹⁶ Lucey excoriated Catholics who wasted their time at “Bridge parties and afternoon teas” and sat in pews while ignoring Catholic social teachings.⁹⁷ Similarly to his speech in 1947, Lucey laid out a path for redemption for these part-time Catholics to join the fray against injustice and help redeem themselves and the nation.

Lucey’s rhetorical strategy called out the evils of society, named the culprits and perpetrators of white supremacy and placed the Archdiocese of San Antonio on the side of the

⁹³ *ibid.*

⁹⁴ Moore, *The South’s Tolerable Alien*, 122.

⁹⁵ Lucey, “Excerpts from Sermon By Lucey in Observation of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of Xavier University for Negro Youth.”

⁹⁶ Martin Luther King Jr, “Letter from a Birmingham Jail,” April 16, 1963. Accessed from: http://kingencyclopedia.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/documentsentry/annotated_letter_from_birmingham/. (Accessed on 31 March, 2017.

⁹⁷ N.C.W.C. News Service, “Bridge, Tea Parties Wasting Time of Catholics, Archbishop Tells Spanish Speaking Meeting,” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, August 25, 1947, The Catholic News Archive.

poor and oppressed. This message inspired many of Lucey's parishioners. For example, Gus Garcia, a prominent San Antonio Latino activist compared Lucey to "F.D.R before political expediency and an overwhelming zest for power corrupted [F.D.R.]."⁹⁸ This effusive praise revealed that Lucey's message had influenced activists in his episcopal diocese. As such, Lucey's advocacy bolstered the spirits of Texas civil rights leaders.

There was a practical element to Lucey's support of Mexican Americans and African-Americans. In 1942, a survey commissioned by the Archdiocese found that the episcopacy Lucey administered had a population of 232,975 Catholics, with the City of San Antonio having a population of 98,189 Catholics.⁹⁹ The city of San Antonio's Catholic population held 65,865 Hispanic Catholics, 877 colored Catholics, and 31,388 Catholics of other origins. Thus, Lucey primarily served non-white Catholics.

Building upon this focus on non-white Catholics, with border and rural Catholics in Texas often being agricultural workers in an exploitative agricultural system, Lucey also advocated for mistreated farmworkers.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, Lucey, once installed as the Archbishop of San Antonio, wasted no time working to improve the lives of these parishioners. In fact, the *Washington Post* called Lucey a "V-12 Engine in a model T chassis" and implied he was a "sparkplug of progress."¹⁰¹ The characterization steers close to truth, as Lucey was an expert on social justice issues, pushed for Catholic education, and monitored whether his priests provided these classes, and heavily micromanaged his diocese.¹⁰²

⁹⁸Gus Garcia, "Gus Garcia To Robert E. Lucey," Letter, February 3, 1957, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

⁹⁹ N.C.W.C. News Service, "Census Shows 232,975 Catholics in San Antonio See," *N.C.W.C. News Service*, January 19, 1942, The Catholic News Archive.

¹⁰⁰ Gina Marie Pitti, *A Ghastly International Racket: The Catholic Church and the Bracero Program in California, 1942-1964* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2001).

¹⁰¹ Agnes Meyer, "Forceful Archbishop Crusades for Mexicans of San Antonio," *Washington Post*, April 28, 1946.

¹⁰² Bronder, *Social Justice and Church Authority: The Public Life of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey.*; Stephen Privett, *The U.S. Catholic Church and Its Hispanic Members: The Pastoral Vision of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey* (San Antonio TX: Trinity University Press, 1988).

Lucey's organizational skills came in handy while combating the inequalities in San Antonio and Lucey engaged in holistic efforts to improve the lives of Mexican-Americans in San Antonio.¹⁰³ The Archdiocese of San Antonio, under Lucey's direction, started a tuberculosis center, established a medical ward in a "Mexican colonia," and helped the Bishop's Committee for the Spanish speaking, which attempted to develop Latino leadership.¹⁰⁴

The *Washington Post* described Lucey as someone who "despised injustice, not because it was immoral, but because it was stupid."¹⁰⁵ This characterization reflected both the disdain Lucey displayed in his rhetoric about segregationists and their enablers, and his disgust at the burden that Jim Crow inflicted on African Americans and Mexican Americans. The injustice towards these groups motivated Lucey and he fought for their rights.

Ultimately, Lucey's exposure to the South's highly racialized culture led him to conclude that, in matters of social, economic, and racial justice, white men were the problem:

The white problem in our country cannot be solved in any reasonable time without the aid of civil law. Many so-called white men hate and despise their fellow Americans whose skin is dark. It is not the men of color who ignore our Constitution, reject our Declaration of Independence, and perpetuate acts of racial bigotry. It is not the Mexican or the Negro who would deprive his fellow citizens of God-given natural rights, Only the white man does that.¹⁰⁶

Lucey wrote this missive to the Senate while it debated the Fair Employment Practices Act, which would have banned employment discrimination based on race.¹⁰⁷ Lucey's insistence that Congress protect the individual reflected *Rerum Novarum's* charge that implicated governments were duty-bound to prevent exploit economic exploitation.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Privett, *The U.S Catholic Church and Its Hispanic Members*.

¹⁰⁴ Meyer, "Forceful Archbishop Crusades for Mexicans of San Antonio."

¹⁰⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Robert Lucey, "Fair Employment Practices Act," Pub. L. No. 78 S. 2048, § Committee on Education and Labor, 81 (1944), <https://congressional.proquest.com/congressional/search/basic/basicsearch>.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ Leo XII, "Rerum Novarum," 28-29.

Lucey's realization that civil law was needed to enforce equality manifested when he replied to angry parishioners that without the Civil Rights act of 1964's passage African Americans would not receive legal equality.¹⁰⁹

Conclusion

Lucey's opposition to discrimination and segregation was influenced by the Catholic social encyclicals—*Rerum Novarum* and *Quadrogesimo Anno*. His commitment to these teachings led him to take positions that, while popular with the *New York Times*, angered many of his white parishioners.¹¹⁰ For example Lucey's belief that "priests and laity should not remain silent in the face of injustice," animated him to take positions that he viewed as, morally correct, despite Southern white elite opposition.¹¹¹ This explains why Lucey allowed San Antonio priests to march in Selma, despite resistance from both his own parishioners and Mobile's Archbishop.¹¹²

Lucey's dedication to Catholic social teaching allowed him to quickly support the civil rights movement after his initial interactions with Jim Crow. When the civil rights movement approached its zeitgeist in the 1950s Lucey enthusiastically desegregated the Archdiocese's parochial schools:

In the field of morality and particularly in the field of social justice and social charity Catholics should lead, not follow. If secular government, military leaders

¹⁰⁹ Robert Lucey, "Letter from Robert E. Lucey to Herbert G. Booth," Letter, May 1964, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

¹¹⁰ Lucey, Oral Memoirs of The Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey.

¹¹¹ Robert Lucey, "Address to Industrial Conference" (Gunter Hotel, April 25, 1955), Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

¹¹² Privett, 19-21.;Ehlinger, "Letter From Mrs. Edmund L. Ehlinger To Robert E. Lucey," Letter, March 11, 1965, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.;Robert Lucey, "Robert E. Lucey To Mrs. Ehlinger," Letter, March 15, 1965, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.;Arthur Lehman, "Letter from Arthur Lehman to Robert E. Lucey," Letter, April 6, 1965, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA; Robert Lucey, "Robert E. Lucey to Arthur Lehman," Letter, April 8, 1965, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

and private organizations can eliminate the sins of segregation and discrimination we can also so do.¹¹³

This letter reveals that, while Lucey enthusiastically advocated for desegregation and attacked the injustices of the Jim Crow era before the mid-1950s, he was unable to do so until the environment was conducive to integration. The environment of the 1950s allowed him to integrate San Antonio's Catholic schools, following the progress of military and other civic organizations. This integration preceded both the integration of San Antonio's public schools, and other Catholic dioceses in Texas.¹¹⁴

Since Lucey believed that the Catholic Church's duty was combating social injustice, he stridently opposed Texas' discriminatory culture and continually advocated for civil rights throughout his tenure. This placed Lucey within a Catholic vanguard opposing racial discrimination and showed how Catholic social teachings could be used to support the civil rights movements. Lucey's devotion to Catholic social thought allowed him to adopt a staunchly pro-civil rights position early in his tenure. During his final public appearance, Lucey stated that "It has always been my firm belief that the Church [should] stand counter to the injustices of any age...[and] confront the challenges and ills of any culture," while following "Christ, the first priest, [who] stood up boldly against the evils of his day."¹¹⁵ Ultimately, Lucey melded Catholic social teachings with his civil rights advocacy and thus exemplified an opposition to Jim Crow predicated on the Catholic conception of mankind's universal equality before God.

¹¹³ Robert Lucey, "Letter to Sister Superiors of Catholic Schools in the Parish," Letter, April 5, 1954, Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

¹¹⁴ This also occurred a month before *Brown v. Board* part 1 was decided. *Ibid.*; Privett, *The U.S Catholic Church and Its Hispanic Members*, 19.; Bruton, "Desegregation in San Antonio," 18.

¹¹⁵ The National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Hispanic Presence: Challenge and Commitment* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1984), no.4, Quoted in Stephen A. Privett, *The U.S. Catholic Church and Its Hispanic Members: The Pastoral Vision of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey*, (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1988).

Bibliography

Anderson, R. Bentley. *Black, White, and Catholic: New Orleans Interracialism, 1947–1956*.

Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005.

Arlene Sánchez-Walsh. “Emma Tenayuca, Religious Elites, and the 1938 Pecan Sheller’s Strike.” In *The Pew and the Picket Line: Christianity and the American Working Class*. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2016.

Baker, Kelly J. *The Gospel According to the Klan: The KKK’s Appeal to Protestant America, 1915-1930*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2011.

Behnken, Brian. *Fighting Their Own Battles: Mexican Americans, African Americans, and the Struggle for Civil Rights*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011.

Bronder, Saul. *Social Justice and Church Authority: The Public Life of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1982.

Bruton, Frederic. “Desegregation in San Antonio.” Masters Thesis, Trinity University, 1969.

Cossen, William S. “Catholic Gatekeepers: The Church and Immigration Reform in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era.” *U.S. Catholic Historian* 34, no. 3 (2016): 1–23.

Ehlinger. Letter. “Letter From Mrs. Edmiund L. Ehlinger To Robert E. Lucey.” Letter, March 11, 1965. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

Garcia, Gus. Letter. “Gus Garcia To Robert E. Lucey.” Letter, February 3, 1957. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

Goldberg, Robert. “Racial Change on the Southern Periphery: The Case of San Antonio, Texas, 1960-1965.” *The Journal of Southern History* 49, no. 3 (1983): 349–74.

Harvell-DeGolier, Thomas. *The Supremacy of Human Rights Everywhere: The Struggle against Jim Crow during World War II*. San Antonio TX: Trinity University, 2017.

Harvey, Paul. *Christianity and Race in the American South: A History*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Holdridge, Herbert. Letter. “Herbert C. Holdridge to Dwight Eisenhower Concerning the Pope’s Commandos.” Letter, January 18, 1959. LBJ Senate Papers 1947-1961, Office Files of George Reedy, Box 427, Reedy: Hate Sheets. Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, and Archives.

Howard-Pitney, David. *The African-American Jeremiad: Appeals for Justice in America*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2005.

Jacobson, David. "David Jacobson to Robert E. Lucey, August 20, 1965," August 20, 1965. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

Bennet, James B. *Religion, and the Rise of Jim Crow in New Orleans*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Krochmal, Max. *Blue Texas: The Making of a Multiracial Democratic Coalition in the Civil Rights Era*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2016.

Lehman, Arthur. Letter. "Letter from Arthur Lehman to Robert E. Lucey." Letter, April 6, 1965. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

Leo XII. "Rerum Novarum: The Conditions of Labor." In *Catholic Social Thought: A Documentary History*, edited by David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010.

Lucey, Robert. "Address to Industrial Conference." Speech. Gunter Hotel, April 25, 1955. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. "Excerpts from Lucey's Address to the Southwest Regional Conference of Catholic Women." Speech, October 4, 1949. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. "Excerpts from Sermon By Lucey in Observation of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of Xavier University for Negro Youth." Excerpts, October 12, 1950. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Fair Employment Practices Act, Pub. L. No. 78 S. 2048, § Committee on Education and Labor, 81 (1944). <https://congressional.proquest.com/congressional/search/basic/basicsearch>.

———. "Justice for Mexicans." *Commonweal*, November 12, 1948.

———. Letter. "Letter from Robert E. Lucey to David Jacobson, October 22nd, 1957." Letter, October 22, 1957. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Letter. "Letter from Robert E Lucey to David Jacobson, August 23, 1965." Letter, August 23, 1965. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Letter. "Letter from Robert E. Lucey to Claude W. Black." Letter, March 12, 1965. Series 8, Scrapbooks. Claude and Zernona Black Papers, Trinity University Special Collections.

———. Letter. "Letter from Robert E. Lucey to Herbert G. Booth." Letter, May 1964. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Letter. "Letter to Sister Superiors of Catholic Schools in the Parish." Letter, April 5, 1954. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Oral Memoirs of The Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey. Interview by H. Wayne Pipkin and Thomas L. Charlton, 72 1971. Baylor Oral History Institute, Baylor University.

———. "Patriotic Meeting." Speech. Memorial Stadium, Austin, TX, December 21, 1941. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Letter. "Robert E. Lucey to Arthur Lehman." Letter, April 8, 1965. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Letter. "Robert E. Lucey To Mrs. Ehlinger." Letter, March 15, 1965. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

———. Robert Lucey Oral History, Interview I. Interview by Dorothy Pierce, October 19, 1968. Oral History Collection. Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

———. "Sermon From Robert E. Lucey." Speech, March 18, 1943. Robert E. Lucey Papers, AASA.

Mason, Kenneth. *African Americans and Race Relations in San Antonio, Texas, 1867-1937*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc., 1998.

McGreevy, John T. *Parish Boundries:: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Meyer, Agnes. "Forceful Archbishop Crusades for Mexicans of San Antonio." *Washington Post*. April 28, 1946.

Moore, Andrew. *The South's Tolerable Alien: Roman Catholics in Alabama and Georgia 1945-1970*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2007.

Moreland, John. *Lunch-Counter Desegregation in Corpus Christi, Galveston, and San Antonio*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Council, 1960.

N.C.W.C. News Service. "4-Day Celebration at Installation of Archbishop Lucey." *N.C.W.C. News Service*, March 31, 1941. The Catholic News Archive.

———. "Bishop Lucey Wildy Applauded as He Addresses Labor Federation." *N.C.W.C. News Service*, May 7, 1940.

———. "Bridge, Tea Parties Wasting Time of Catholics, Archbishop Tells Spanish Speaking Meeting." *N.C.W.C. News Service*, August 25, 1947. The Catholic News Archive.

———. "Census Shows 232,975 Catholics in San Antonio See." *N.C.W.C. News Service*,

January 19, 1942. The Catholic News Archive.

———. “Church Defender of Human Rights Bishop Declares.” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, December 9, 1940.

———. “City Auditorium Offered in Connection With The Archbishop’s Installation.” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, February 3, 1941. The Catholic News Archive.

———. “Labor Encyclical’s Teachings Studied at Priest’s Session.” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, May 22, 1935. The Catholic News Archive.

———. “Real Christian Truly Is His Brother’s Keeper, Archbishop Tells Charity Meeting.” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, October 13, 1947. The Catholic News Archive.

———. ““San Antonio Paper Pays Glowing Tribute to Archbishop Lucey.” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, February 3, 1941. The Catholic News Archive.

———. “Texas Prelate’s Views on Child Labor.” *N.C.W.C. News Service*, February 27, 1937. The Catholic News Archive.

“New Dealing Archbishop.” *Time*, April 7, 1941.

Orozco, Cynthia. *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed: The Rise of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2009.

Pitti, Gina Marie. *A Ghastly International Racket: The Catholic Church and the Bracero Program in California, 1942-1964*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2001.

Pius XI. “Quadregesimo Anno: After Forty Years.” In *Catholic Social Thought: A Documentary Heritage*, edited by David J. O’Brien and Thomas A. Shannon. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010.

Privett, Stephen. “Robert E. Lucey: Evangelization and Catechist among Hispanic Catholics.” Ph.D Dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1985.

———. *The U.S. Catholic Church and Its Hispanic Members: The Pastoral Vision of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey*. San Antonio TX: Trinity University Press, 1988.

Schultz, Kevin. *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Wuthnow, Robert. *Rough Country: How Texas Became America’s Most Powerful Bible-Belt State*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014.