THE NEW AND OLD ANTI-CATHOLICISM AND THE ANALOGICAL IMAGINATION

MARK S. MASSA, S.J.

[The author explores the sense of "alterity" experienced by Catholics and critics of Catholicism in the United States in the last 20 years. He examines instances of what has been termed the "new anti-Catholicism" manifested in "public" culture (as opposed to theology and ecclesiastical politics), utilizing David Tracy's trope of the analogical imagination in order to situate this new animus within a much larger cultural phenomenon.]

A NUMBER OF PUBLIC intellectuals tracking the relation of religious belief to North American "popular culture" have noted that the past few decades have witnessed a resurgence of what Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., once termed "the deepest bias in the history of the American people," more recently labeled by George Weigel as simply "new anti-Catholicism."[1] And almost all of the pundits charting this resurgence have noted that the social location of this new animus would appear to be a somewhat murky moving target, certainly more difficult to pin down than the militantly evangelical Protestant ministers, nativist groups such as the Know Nothings and the Ku Klux Klan, or even the "professional" Catholic haters such as Paul Blanshard, of our cultural past. (This being said, the ancient and revered vocation of "professional Catholic hater" has been quite credibly revived in the career of Jack Chick and his hate-filled car-

MARK S. MASSA, S.J., is professor of theology and chair for undergraduate studies in the theology department at Fordham University, New York, where he is also director of the American Studies Program. He received a Th.D. from Harvard University in church history. His most recent monograph is *Catholics and American Culture: Fulton Sheen, Dorothy Day, and the Notre Dame Football Team* (Crossroad, 1999). He is currently completing a book-length study of cultural anti-Catholicism in the second half of the 20th century.

toon empire.) More specifically, practitioners of a new Catholic apologetics as ideologically diverse as Andrew Greeley, George Weigel, and William Donovan increasingly have targeted the contemporary "secular culture" of the United States itself as the chief engine of anti-Catholic impulses, a culture termed by one especially smart commentator "the culture of disbelief."[2]

THE NEW ANTI-CATHOLICISM

Some interpreters of this contemporary anti-Catholicism (Andrew Greeley) would say that, to begin with, the new anti-Catholicism is not all that new. Indeed, Greeley argues that recent anti-Catholic displays simply represent a contemporary form of an animus that never really went away. Other interpreters (George Weigel) have offered a gloss on the secularization theories of Peter Berger and Martin Marty, arguing that in North America (unlike, say, Germany) "secularity" does not mean the disappearance of religion, but rather its privatization—its removal from the public sphere into domestic quarters. Thus, so this interpretation goes, a resolutely public religion such as Catholicism—a very large institutional religion that refuses to keep silent on neuralgic public issues such as abortion—opens itself ineluctably to cultural criticism and derision. Both interpretations undoubtedly explain at least some of the impulses that "watchdog groups" such as Donovan's Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights have identified as "anti-Catholic" in contemporary culture. But a number of Catholic intellectuals across the ideological spectrum are united with each other and with Catholic apologists of a century ago in their complaint that Roman Catholicism and, in the last few decades, "official" Catholic positions on abortion, homosexuality, and the role of

---

[2] The Arthur Schlesinger quote is in James Martin, "The Last Acceptable Prejudice?" *America* 182 (March 25, 2000) 9; George Weigel, "The New Anti-Catholicism," *Commonweal* 127 (April 7, 2000) 6; for Andrew Greeley's understanding of the "last acceptable prejudice," see: *An Ugly Little Secret: Anti-Catholicism in North America* (Kansas City: Sheed, Andrews & McMeel, 1977). On Donovan and the "Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights," see William A. Donovan, "The Deepest Bias: Anti-Catholicism in American Life," one-hour video cassette (New York: Catholic League, 1996); "Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights" available at www.catholicleague.org. The phrase "culture of disbelief" is from Stephen Carter, *The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion* (New York: Basic Books, 1993). For an excellent study of 19th-century Catholic, North American, culture tensions, see Jenny Franchot, *Roads to Rome: The Antebellum Protestant Encounter with Catholicism* (Berkeley: University of California, 1994). See also "Booksellers' Group May Expel Chick," *Christianity Today* 25 (October 23, 1981) 62.

women in the community are targeted for cultural ridicule, media carping, and political litmus-testing so often, and so nastily, in comparison with other religious groups (say, evangelical African Americans, Orthodox Jews, and devout Muslims) who espouse analogously "non-mainstream" beliefs in the culture, that a looming if indefinable "something else" must be going on.[3]

And the cultural evidence supporting the fear of such a "something else" is arresting when presented in summary form. Sexually rapacious and physically abusive nuns and priests now appear as stock characters in TV soap operas and in prime-time shows such as "Ally McBeal," as well as in off-Broadway shows such as "Late Night Catechism" and "Jeffrey." Hollywood-made movies such as "Dogma" and "Stigmata," as anti-religious as much as specifically anti-Catholic, nonetheless consistently present religion itself in ways targeted to highlight and (and thus offend) Catholic sensibilities.[4]

Novelty stores now feature a meretricious "Boxing Nun" hand-puppet, while at the other end of the cultural spectrum the furor over a dung-covered picture of the Virgin Mary at the 1999 "Sensation" exhibit at the Brooklyn Museum of Art merited articles in the religion column of the New York *Times,* articles that considered the charge of anti-Catholicism on the part of the museum. This journalistic situation was ironic since the *Times* is the object of frequent denunciation by conservative Catholic apologists as being fiercely if "sophisticatedly" anti-Catholic. During an especially nasty act of "political theater" in St. Patrick's Cathedral sponsored by the New York chapter of ACTUP, a consecrated host was desecrated in an act so religiously repugnant that it provoked Catholic outrage across the ideological spectrum. An "expert" on PBS's "Newshour with Jim Lehrer," discussing mandatory DNA testing for criminals, identified

---

[3] For secularization as privatization, see: Martin Marty, *The Modern Schism: Three Paths to the Secular* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969); see especially his chapter on "Controlled Secularity." Peter Berger, *The Sacred Canopy* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967). On this sense of a looming prejudice related to an older strain of anti-Catholicism, see Patrick Flaherty, "Anti-Catholicism," *Chicago Tribune,* March 3, 2000, p. 18; "The Revenge of the Know Nothings," editorial, *The Wall Street Journal,* April 1, 2000. The political battle over the appointment of a Catholic chaplain to the U.S. House of Representatives, and over anti-Catholic pronouncements at Bob Jones University, produced a spate of articles and essays. See Jay Nordlinger, "Most Hated U," *National Review* 52 (July 17, 2000) 40–42; "Anti-Catholicism?" *Commonweal* 127 (April 7, 2000) 6.

[4] " 'Catechism' Commentary Accused of Anti-Catholic Bias" *Los Angeles Times,* May 15, 1999, p. 4; Rick Hinshaw, "Anti-Catholicism Today," *The Priest* 56 (February, 2000) 14–22.

Catholic priests, along with homeless people and teenagers, as being "at risk" for criminal behavior.[5]

The randomness and ubiquity of these "incidents" spanning the cultural spectrum from newspapers of record to titilating tourist shops in New York's West Village form a pattern that is singular, and, in the minds of some, suspicious: it is as though Catholic iconography and belief is somehow perceived by large sections of the culture as "safe" for gentle (or not-so-gentle) humor and sarcasm in a way that, say, men in *kippas* or pictures of Martin Luther King are not.

What immediately strikes the reader of the literature produced by contemporary Catholic apologists lamenting the resurgence of this "last acceptable prejudice" in the U.S., however, is the sense that they shared with overtly hostile critics of the Church that Catholicism somehow does not "fit" into modern, specifically American, culture. The new Catholic apologists, both those who see the new anti-Catholicism as related in intrinsic ways to the older animus, and those who see it as a unique North American form of secularity, seem to share a sense that the Catholic mind-set somehow embodies a worldview different from the concerns and values of American popular culture and that institutional Catholicism seems actually to see a different world than the one many Americans live in.[6]

My contention is that this sense of Catholic alterity in contemporary North American culture—shared by both apologists for, and critics of, the Catholic Church—is actually quite important, and needs to be examined from a theological perspective. I explore the possibility (as a white male cleric profoundly loyal to, if sometimes critical of, the institutional Church) that Catholicism offers a quite distinctive way of seeing the world, a prerational lens, if you will, identified by David Tracy as the "analogical imagination." That imagination, according to Tracy, differentiates Catholics from other Christian believers (most obviously, from Protestant Christians who make up the majority of U.S. citizens), and might help to explain why guardians of institutional Catholicism can be seen, and in fact probably are, more prone to worry about group loyalty and theological orthodoxy than protecting the rights of individual believers and guaranteeing the free expression of religious belief. Using the trope of Tracy's "analogical imagination," I explore the ways in which the new anti-Catholicism is related to the old anti-Catholicism brought to these shores on board the Arbella in

---

[5] "Anger Over Work Evokes Anti-Catholic Shadow," *New York Times,* October 3, 1999, pp. 1, 48; James Martin, "The Last Acceptable Prejudice?" 8–16.

[6] The articles of Weigel, Donovan, and Flaherty (among others) evince this sense of Catholic "non-fit" in contemporary North American culture.

the 17th century, and I offer some initial theological reasons for the diffuseness of that animus in contemporary North American culture.[7]

I consider this perception of contemporary, cultural anti-Catholicism in four steps: first, I explore the anti-Catholic tradition of North American culture historically, starting in the present and walking backwards through the layers of a rather revered nativist intellectual tradition, in the process linking the new with the old forms of the animus. Secondly, I briefly adumbrate a number of political/cultural stands taken by Catholicism that have made non-Catholic Americans (understandably) anxious regarding the Roman Church's "fit" into North American culture. Thirdly, I examine how the insights of both theologian David Tracy and sociologist Andrew Greeley can illumine this anything-but-new nativist tradition as a theological datum that might be useful for U.S. Catholics in understanding their own tradition creatively and unapologetically. And fourthly, I propose briefly how U.S. Catholics might utilize the theological insights of Tracy and the sociological insights of Greeley to sift through the myriad accusations of "anti-Catholicism" in contemporary U.S. culture in order to discern the genuine from the misplaced fears of anti-Catholic prejudice.

THE OLD ANTI-CATHOLICISM

Contemporary Catholic commentators such as James Martin have remarked that some of the most virulent forms of a new anti-Catholicism appear to live a flourishing life in the culture-at-large, well outside the purview of denominational structures and theological debates. Such anti-Catholicism lives a resolutely "secular" existence, although now and then it appears in odd religious form in places such as Bob Jones University. As Martin has so deftly argued, many of the most eloquent critics of contemporary Catholicism's role in American political, social, and ethical culture seem to steer clear of theological/religious language entirely. Their concerns seem almost-entirely cultural, without any interest in questions of transcendence or religious discourse, theological or otherwise.[8]

From a longer view of American cultural studies, however, it is extremely likely that this new anti-Catholicism is less recent than its name might suggest; indeed, the new "cultural" anti-Catholicism is at least half a century old, first emerging as an identifiable intellectual stance in the con-

---

[7] David Tracy, *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (New York: Crossroad, 1981) esp. 412 ff. See also Andrew Greeley, *The Catholic Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California, 2000) Introduction, "The Sacraments of Sensibility," 1–21. Greeley's book is dedicated to "David Tracy, theologian of the Enchanted Imagination," frontispiece.

[8] Martin, "The Last Acceptable Prejudice" 8–9.

sciousness of ordinary Americans in the unlikely decade following World War II, after the "last good war" had been waged and won, and America's "greatest generation" were taking part in what Gibson Winter glumly termed the "suburban captivity of the churches." It was ostensibly a decade that saw the end of all ideology (including religious prejudice), if for no other reason than because "genuine religion"—the religion of what David Riesman termed the "inner directed"—was lamentably being replaced with the shallow need to belong by the "other directed" to churches and synagogues, no less than country clubs. The most famous voice in the emergence of this cultural form of anti-Catholicism was undoubtedly Paul Blanshard, although he was aided and abetted by a panoply of civil libertarian groups such as "Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State," and "Americans for Democratic Action."[9]

Paul Blanshard's militantly hostile understanding of Catholicism's threat to American democratic institutions certainly drew on the earlier, religious, traditions of anti-Catholicism, but his anxieties were essentially political and cultural, and directly related to the tense geopolitics of the Cold War. Blanshard's concerns focused on the Catholic totalitarian presence within the world's leading democracy in the years after World War II. For Blanshard, Catholicism represented less a theological creed than an authoritarian cultural system, directed by foreign (and foreign-appointed) figures unaccountable to the folks who paid the bills. Blanshard saw the "children of light" and the "children of darkness" less as eschatological categories than as quite identifiable geopolitical groups: those who lived in popular democracies, and those who lived in authoritarian systems. Blanshard's anxieties, most famously argued in his "classic," *American Freedom and Catholic Power* (1949), but also pressed in works with such as *Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power* (1951), *The Irish and Catholic Power* (1953) and in his *The Future of Catholic Power* (1961), a work overt in its fears of what the Kennedy presidency might bring, thus represented a resolutely 20th-century, Cold War political strain of the anti-Catholic impulse.[10]

For Blanshard, like John Dewey, "democracy" itself—or at least Ameri-

[9] Gibson Winter, *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961); David Reisman, *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven: Yale University, 1950); Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1955) 57–59; Lawrence P. Creedon and William D. Falcon, *United for Separation: An Analysis of POAU Assaults on Catholicism* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1959) 15–21.

[10] Paul Blanshard, *American Freedom and Catholic Power* (Boston: Beacon, 1949) esp. 5–8, and chap. 12; Blanshard, *Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power* (Boston: Beacon, 1951); Blanshard, *The Irish and Catholic Power: An American Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon, 1953); Blanshard, *The Future of Catholic*

can democracy in its battle to the death with the totalitarian Soviet Union—was religious, or even more properly a religion, with its own creed, rituals, and scriptures. That creed included the belief that *all* legitimate power, in Church, state, and community, was bestowed by human beings on their representatives, and that it was politically undemocratic as well as ethically repugnant to claim to have a "corner" on truth. But in a real (and, from a theological standpoint, arresting) sense, Blanshard went even beyond Dewey in constructing American democracy not only as a "common faith," but as an overt "theology," with individualism, democracy, and representative government as a the new trinity. For Blanshard, then—in view of what he considered the perspicacious American creed—"the Catholic problem was still with us." Indeed, in view of the Soviet threat, the "Catholic problem" never constituted more of a threat.[11]

Significant parts of Blanshard's classic, published in monograph form by Beacon Press in 1949, had already seen the light of published day in the libertarian journal *The Nation,* so his critics knew what was coming. Book-length rejoinders thus began appearing within a year: Dale Francis's *American Freedom and Paul Blanshard* (1950) and James O'Neill's *Catholicism and American Freedom* (1952). But Blanshard's most important, and most gifted, debate partner by the end of the decade was Jesuit scholar John Courtney Murray, whose collection of essays *We Hold These Truths* (1960) and especially Murray's famous distinction between "articles of peace" and "articles of faith" in interpreting the Bill of Rights might be read on one level as an extended series of arguments meant to counter, point by point, Blanshard's flawed cultural religion.[12]

While Blanshard's anxieties regarding Catholic authoritarianism during the Cold War certainly set the stage for at least some of the anti-Catholic animus in late-20th century popular culture, he hardly invented the genre of cultural anti-Catholicism among intellectuals. Indeed, Blanshard's understanding of "culture" itself drew on an even earlier strain of dis-ease with Catholicism that had appeared in the 1920s and 1930s, during an intellectual crusade pressed almost entirely by liberal intellectuals and aca-

---

Power (Washington: Protestants and Others United for the Separation of Church and State, 1961).

[11] Blanshard, *American Freedom,* chap. 12; John McGreevy, "Thinking on One's Own: Catholicism in the American Intellectual Imagination, 1928–1960," *Journal of American History* 84 (June, 1997) 97–131, at 97.

[12] Dale Francis, *American Freedom and Paul Blanshard* (Notre Dame: Ave Maria, 1950); James M. O'Neill, *Catholicism and American Freedom* (New York: Harper, 1952); John Courtney Murray, *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960). See especially the second essay in this collection, entitled "Articles of Peace" that answers the secularists' read of the Constitution.

demics seeking to define a distinctive American culture "come of age." Blanshard mined this earlier strain almost invisibly, so latent had it become among American academics and writers.

As John McGreevy has so brilliantly argued, from the mid-1930s through the 1950s, intellectuals in the U.S. labored to "demonstrate the nonhierarchical sources of American culture, a project in which Catholicism played a strategic, antithetical role." Basic to this culture-defining project, pressed by a new "self-consciously cosmopolitan American intelligentsia" seeking to create a democratic national vision, was an experimental scientific worldview and the widespread acceptance of anthropological notions of culture, pressed by intellectuals such as Dewey, Robert Merton, and the founders of the New School for Social Research. As Walter Lippmann had explained, there could be "no compromise possible between authority and the scientific spirit" in the search for "truth" (by then understood as a pragmatic, provisional set of hypotheses). In all of human culture—material, scientific, ethical—the "false security" of a priori assertions had to be replaced by "hypothesis testing." It was in this spirit that John Dewey could assert that America's "common faith" was a pragmatic belief that "the continued disclosing of truth through directed cooperative human endeavor is more religious in quality than is any faith in a completed revelation."[13]

Robert Lynd, who with his wife Helen had published the landmark social scientific study of Muncie, Indiana, in *Middletown,* had defined "culture" in this spirit as "the things that a group of people inhabiting a common geographical area do, the ways they do things and the ways they think and feel about things, their material tools and their values and *symbols.*" In this organic if now "scientific" view of culture, each piece of a culture—including American culture—had to "fit in" to the larger picture. Separatism in any form—physical, symbolic, demographic—now posed an "integration problem."[14]

With the task of uncovering the pragmatic, non-hierarchical sources of America's democratic culture thus defined, the ideological opponent for most intellectuals quickly became apparent. With the exception of Robert Hutchins at the University of Chicago and the few neo-Aristotelian intel-

---

[13] This and the following five paragraphs borrow insights from John McGreevy's article, "Thinking on One's Own" 100–101; Walter Lippmann, *Drift and Mastery: An Attempt to Diagnose the Current Unrest* (New York: M. Kennersley, 1914) 162; John Dewey, *A Common Faith* (New Haven: Yale University, 1934) 26; Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1991) 328 ff.

[14] McGreevy, "Thinking on One's Own" 111, 100; Robert S. Lynd, *Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1939) 19.

lectuals clustered around his singular retrieval of natural law philosophy, only Catholic intellectuals maintained the kind of foundationalist/ supernaturalist metaphysics that challenged the pragmatic, social scientific experimentalism of secular American academics. Building on Leo XIII's call in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879) for Catholic philosophy and theology to build on the natural law foundations of Thomas Aquinas, Catholic universities, law and education schools, and periodicals had, by the early 20th century, become centers for natural law conversation and inquiry. Thomistic metaphysics resting on the secure, rational knowledge of the supernatural basis for nature itself thus became the premier, architectonic discipline upon which philosophy, ethics, political theory, and scientific experimentation rested. The core of this neo-Thomistic, natural law worldview could easily be seen (and was so seen) as a frontal assault on social scientific, "modernist" knowledge. For the Thomists, God's existence, the basis for all epistemological and cultural discussion, could be proven by reason. Any attempt, precisely like that undertaken by Dewey, Merton, and Lippmann, to ground cultural study in pragmatic, provisional, or naturalist understandings of the world was doomed to failure, since the "natural" world could only be understood and appreciated in light of the "supernatural."[15]

It was in light of such mutually exclusive understandings of "knowledge" and "truth" that Walter Lippmann could assert in 1914 that "of course [Catholicism] was hostile to democracy and to every force that tended to make people self-sufficient"; that Yale University's A.K. Rodgers could aver that Thomists seemed incapable of taking part in the "open-ended search for truth"; and perhaps most disturbingly in light of the integrated understanding of human culture accepted as axiomatic by most social scientists, French sociologist André Siegfried could warn his American colleagues that "the Catholic Church is thus a thing apart from the heart of the American body politic. It collaborates in its own time and in its own way, but in the long run remains distinct and does not fuse."[16]

The almost immediate applause accorded to Blanshard's works by social scientists and academics in the mid-20th century was rooted, at least in part, in this epistemological parting of the ways that dates from the first third of the 20th century, when secular and Catholic intellectuals (both

[15] McGreevy, "Thinking on One's Own" 102. Gerald A. McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York: Fordham University, 1992).

[16] McGreevy, "Thinking on One's Own" 102–3; Lippman, *Drift and Mastery* 115; *Present Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism: An International Symposium,* ed. John S. Zybura (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1926) 29–30; André Siegfried, *America Comes of Age,* trans. H.H. Hemming and Doris Hemming (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1927) 50–51.

being comparatively recent self-conscious groups in the U.S.) ceased practicing the same language games. It accounts as well for the often latent but palpable mistrust of Catholic universities and the teaching of theology as an academic discipline by academic groups such as the American Association of University Professors, which declared in its founding documents that one of the most basic duties of academics to their students was to enable them creatively to "think about heresies."[17]

But resolutely "high brow" intellectuals and academics such as Blanshard and Dewey, who voiced grave concerns about Catholic alterity in the democratic culture of the U.S. in the 20th century, themselves built on much older, far more widespread, fears of Catholics as "others" in the culture of North America. These fears of cultural alterity are usually termed by historians as "nativism," that is, xenophobic anxieties originally related to religion, but including as well ethnic, racial, and socio-economic fears of loss of control to "cultural outsiders." In a sense, the older, 19th-century nativist impulse set the stage for ideological fears of "Catholic outsiders" during the Cold War by making those fears both widespread in ("low") popular culture and an acceptable topic of discussion on the level of ("high") cultural comment. The "public intellectuals" of the mid-19th century (evangelical Protestant ministers) secured an interested audience that would listen to the public intellectuals of the next century (academics and journalists) voicing similar fears, but in a new vocabulary.

In its nativist form, anti-Catholicism represented a densely-textured subcategory of a larger pattern of "boundary" concerns that included anti-Semitism, racial prejudice against African Americans and Asian Americans, and anti-immigrant political crusades. Thus, the "Protestant Crusade" against Roman Catholicism and its adherents in North America, magisterially narrated in its 18th- and 19th-century forms by Ray Allen Billington in 1938, commenced with the Puritan landing of the Arbella in what would become the City Upon a Hill. But by the early 19th century, popular fears of Catholic encroachment on the "Protestant errand" in North America had blended with other a number of other anxieties.[18]

The most popular nativist tract of the 19th century, Maria Monk's *Awful Disclosures of the Hotel Dieu Monastery,* was "narrated" by a brain-injured young woman who had been treated as a patient in a Catholic asylum in

[17] Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996) 73.

[18] Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860: A Story of the Origins of American Nativism* (New York: Macmillan, 1938) chap. 1 and 2; Thomas More Brown, "The Image of the Beast: Anti-Papal Rhetoric in Colonial America," in *Conspiracy: The Fear of Subversion in American History,* ed. Richard D. Curry and Thomas Brown (New York: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, 1972) 1–20.

Canada; but it sold over 300,000 copies by the Civil War through the efforts of a group of Protestant clergymen broadcasting "poor Maria's story." Many of the "classics" of the nativist genre were similarly the products of Protestant clergymen and home missionaries—probably the most respected public intellectuals in their culture. Thus Lyman Beecher, the patriarch of arguably the most influential Protestant group in 19th-century America, published his *Plea for the West* in 1834, a work which has been given credit for giving birth to the "Protestant frontier thesis" by commingling American nationalism, Protestant spirituality, and the manifest destiny of continental conquest. Likewise, Josiah Strong's *Our Country,* a work tellingly published by the American Home Missionary Society during the high Gilded Age, argued that responsible Americans (read "Protestants") had to clean up their own act in domestic cities teaming with immigrant others (read "Catholics and Jews") in order to justify exporting the fruits of American democratic culture abroad (read "imperialistic Protestant missions" to Hawaii, the Philippines, and Cuba). Theological, ethnic, imperialistic, and economic impulses mingled so freely in these works as to demand a multivalent reading of their origins.[19]

More recent scholars mining this lode of American nativism in the late-19th and early-20th centuries such as Carlton Beals, Donald Kinzer, and especially cultural historian John Higham, have explored even further the complex congeries of impulses that informed nativism. Thus Higham has identified four major periods of virulent nativism that rendered the cultural landscape inhospitable to U.S. Catholics well into the 20th century, all of which were periods of cultural strain due to straightened economic conditions, increased immigration, or political uncertainty: the late 1790s, the 1850s, the period extending from 1886 to 1896, and the years immediately following World War I.[20]

But it was not a historical accident that Beecher and Strong were evangelical Protestant ministers, nor that Maria Monk set her tale in a convent. Indeed, the logic of the trajectory of this "backwards narrative" of cultural anti-Catholicism from Weigel, though Blanshard, Dewey, and Beecher to

[19] Lyman Beecher, *A Plea for the West* (Cincinnati: Truman & Smith, 1834); Josiah Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (New York: American Home Missionary Society, 1889; rev. ed. 1891); Marie Fell, *The Foundation of Nativism in American Textbooks, 1783–1860* (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1941); Agnes McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky to 1860* (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1944).
[20] Carlton Beals, *Brass Knuckle Crusade: The Great Know-Nothing Conspiracy* (New York: Hastings House, 1960); Donald Kinzer, *An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association* (Seattle: University of Washington, 1964); John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1980; original ed. 1963) 54 ff.

Maria Monk, leads to the distinct possibility that, in its oldest, purest form, the American cultural anxiety regarding Catholicism was exactly what its name proclaims: a distrust and fear of Catholicism and Catholics, rooted in theology. This religious distrust, born in the 16th century and carried to the New England in the next, represents a logical by-product of what Perry Miller brilliantly discerned half a century ago as "the evangelical basis" of U.S. culture itself, and what Ernest Lee Tuveson identified as the "Protestant philosophy of history" that has informed U.S. domestic and foreign policy from John Winthrop to the present. This evangelical Protestant tradition, as presented by Miller and Tuveson, contributed to the profoundly Protestant ethos of colonial America, and was evinced in cultural artifacts such as the *New England Primer,* Guy Faulkes Day, and the Dudleian Lectures at Harvard, all of which were overtly theological in form and tenor.[21]

And although the strictly "evangelical" component of this Protestant theological tradition had become somewhat evanescent by the 20th century, the older "Reformed basis" of U.S. culture has continued to play an important role in interpreting the meaning of America, especially as presented by religious intellectuals and cultural historians. The dean of American church historians at the University of Chicago, William Warren Sweet, could thus write in an influential "Interpretation" published in 1947, that "all the great concepts for which American democracy stands today—individual rights, freedom of conscience, self-government, and complete religious liberty—are concepts coming out of the left wing of the Reformation." Likewise, the magisterial American historian Henry Steele Commager's great study of the "American mind," published in 1950, concluded that, even though the "strictly theological" aspects of Puritanism evaporated from American culture in the course of the 18th and 19th centuries, America had happily retained the "Puritan inheritance of the respect for the individual, the recognition of the ultimate authority of reason, and of allegiance to principles rather than to persons."[22]

This use of the Reformation to contrast Catholicism and American de-

---

[21] Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America: From the Revolution to the Civil War* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965) esp. chap. 2: "The Evangelical Basis." The classic study of New England intellectual culture is Miller's two volume *The New England Mind* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1953–1963); Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Redeemer Nation: The Idea of America's Millennial Role* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1968). See also J.C.D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660–1832; Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University, 1994) esp. 271 ff.; Winthrop Hudson, *Religion in America,* 5th ed. (Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1992).

[22] McGreevey, "Thinking on One's Own," 114–16; William Warren Sweet, *The American Churches: An Interpretation* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1947) 3;

mocracy was likewise evident in the American scholarly use of the work of Max Weber in the 1930s and 1940s. Harvard sociologist Talcott Parsons, who had translated Weber's work in 1930 as *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism,* published a short essay on John Calvin the following year claiming that although the general tenor of Calvin's Geneva might appear authoritarian, the "latent implications" of Calvinism tended toward "democratic individualism." Likewise Robert Merton, in what has been called "perhaps the most influential essay on the history of science ever written by an American," confirmed Weber's argument that the Protestant ethic supported not only capitalism but also the emergence of a modern science based on experiment: Calvinist Protestants in 17th-century England replaced "cloistered contemplation" with "active experimentation."[23]

THE CULTURAL CHALLENGES OF CATHOLICISM IN THE U.S.

Over against this "backwards narrative" from Blanshard to the perceived Puritan theological roots of U.S. culture, however, on a different historical trajectory, one might trace backwards various threatening cultural positions of institutional Catholicism in the U.S., tensive positions vis-à-vis popular democratic culture. And these positions, at least when viewed from some perspectives, raised profound questions about Catholicism's "fit" in the U.S., and led to understandable anxieties regarding its presence in "Nature's Nation."

Among the most troubling aspects of Paul Blanshard's accusations against institutional Catholicism in the decade after World War II is the fact that he utilized a number of published works by Catholic scholars in making his arguments regarding the menace of Catholicism to democratic values. Blanshard could point to American Catholic intellectuals of the previous generation such as neo-Thomist contemporaries of John Dewey, Robert Lynd, and André Siegfried who were most assuredly engaged in an intellectual trajectory foreign and frightening to American social scientists searching for the "non-hierarchical sources" of American culture. One of

---

Henry Steele Comager, *The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1950) 165.

[23] McGeevy, "Thinking on One's Own" 115–16; Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, "The German Theological Sources and German Politics," in *Weber's Protestant Ethic: Origins, Evidence, Context,* ed. Hartmut Lehmann and Guenther Roth (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993) 27–28; Arthur Mitzman, *The Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Max Weber* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1970) 67–71; Talcott Parsons, "Jean Calvin" [1930] in *The Early Essays,* ed. Charles Camic (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991) 41–42; Robert K. Merton, *Science, Technology, and Society in Seventeenth Century England* (New York: Fertig, 1970; orig. ed. 1938) 99.

the most famous *bête noire* presented by Blanshard to prove the Catholic threat to democratic freedoms at mid-century was a work published in 1922 by Moorhouse F.X. Millar, S.J., of Fordham University, and (the "Right Reverend New Dealer") John A. Ryan, a much-touted "Catholic liberal" who would become a major player in supporting President Roosevelt's New Deal. Their work, *The State and the Church,* sought to apply neo-scholastic political principles to the American circumstance. While Millar and Ryan agreed that, for reasons of expediency, U.S. Catholics should accept both separation of church and state, and religious freedom at that time, nonetheless Catholics were obliged to believe that the Church was entitled to legal establishment. Indeed, they pointed out that even in the U.S.

Constitutions can be changed, and non-Catholic *sects* may decline to the point that the political *proscription* of them may become feasible and expedient. What protection would they then have against a Catholic state? The latter could *logically tolerate* only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the *dissenting groups.* It could not permit them to carry on *general propaganda* not accord their organization certain privileges that had formerly been extended to all religious corporations, for example, exemption from taxation.[24]

Such admittedly "theoretical" possibilities (what neo-Scholastic scholars termed the "thesis/hypothesis" distinction between the ideal and actual situations of the Church) did nothing at all to calm non-Catholic fears regarding the Church's long-term aims in North American culture. Likewise, within a few years of Blanshard's first salvo, Senator Joseph McCarthy appeared to name the era that saw the publication of increasingly anxious works denouncing Catholic threats to American civil liberties.

Senator Joseph McCarthy was perceived by those both within and outside his church to voice the fears of millions of American Catholics in Mindszenty Circles across the land, fears that the "forces of light" in Eastern Europe were being vanquished by the Communists. Those quite legitimate fears of the Communist campaign against religion in Eastern Europe, however, became part of an increasingly immoral congeries of accusations pressed by McCarthy against high-placed figures in the U.S. federal government and military. Despite the valiant stands taken against McCarthy's morally heinous witch-hunts by Catholics such as the editors of *Commonweal,* Bishop Bernard Shiel of Chicago, and Senator Dennis Chavez, it is also clear, in historical retrospect, that many of McCarthy's most public supporters were perceived to have disturbingly institutional Catholic connections: the unproven but telling myth that McCarthy first conceived the idea of an anti-communist crusade from Father Edmund Walsh, the Jesuit

---

[24] John A. Ryan and Moorhouse F.X. Millar, S.J., *The State and the Church* (New York: Macmillan, 1922) 38 (italics mine).

founder and dean of Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service; the consistent journalistic support offered the senator in the pages of Catholic periodicals such as the *Brooklyn Tablet* and *Our Sunday Visitor;* the thunderous applause given McCarthy at "communion breakfasts" sponsored by groups such as the New York Police Department's Patrolman's Benevolent Association; the numerous oblique but admiring accolades to the Wisconsin senator offered by prelates such as New York's Francis Cardinal Spellman. Donald Crosby has limned the reaction of many Protestant Americans to the senator's crusade in his fine study of McCarthy and the Church:

Many Protestants [saw] in Joe McCarthy the lurid image of everything they had come to fear in American Catholicism: like many Catholics he showed a certain disinterest in civil liberties, he demanded conformity to his own set of opinions, he was intolerant of all opposition, he dogmatized endlessly, and he made a shambles of the democratic process by abusing the witnesses who came before his congressional committee.[25]

For Blanshard and his ideological allies in the A.D.A and *The Nation,* the "antics" of McCarthy and his Catholic supporters seemed like the worst of their fears about Catholics come to vivid life, and they fed older fires of anxiety stoked in the 19th century by the declaration of papal infallibility and Pius IX's "Syllabus of Errors." These earlier ultramontanist pronouncements had provoked a spectrum of published queries in mainstream periodicals such as the *North American Review,* speculating in uncomfortable tones on the meaning for democratic culture of papal denunciations of separation of church and state, freedom of the press and religion, and of "modern culture" itself as the "source of all heresies."

It could thus be argued, and was so argued, that Protestant fears of Catholic authoritarian designs on the "free institutions of the Republic" represented considerably more than the irrational fears of hated-filled nativists. Catholics "on the other side" of Vatican II at century's end, secure in the contemporary Church's manifold announcements of support for basic human rights, like that of religion, might find it embarrassing to remember such pronouncements, but such remembrance is historically salutary in contextualizing at least part of three centuries of North American anxiety regarding "the Catholic threat."

[25] Donald Crosby, *God, Church, and Flag: Senator Joseph McCarthy and the Catholic Church* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina, 1978) 123. See also: Mark Massa, *Catholics and American Culture: Fulton Sheen, Dorothy Day, and the Notre Dame Football Team* (New York: Crossroad, 1999) chap. 3, "Catholicism as a Cultural System: Joe McCarthy, Clifford Geertz, and the 'Conspiracy So Immense,' " 57–81.

THE ANALOGICAL AND DIALECTICAL IMAGINATIONS

In my judgment, William Donovan on the one hand and Paul Blanshard on the other share a sense of Catholic institutional alterity in modern American culture that is anything but new, although incarnated in new forms at the end of the 20th century. I now wish to explore the theological reasons why both sides in the contemporary debate about anti-Catholicism might very well agree that the popular democratic culture of the U.S. possesses "religious" values and beliefs about the individual, about privacy, and about human rights to which all denominational religion must conform, values and beliefs that some Americans believe institutional Catholicism violates. And it is precisely here that the insights of theologian David Tracy might help us to uncover some of the deeper sources for the perceived sense of Catholic "otherness" in American culture.[26]

In one of the seminal works of 20th-century theology, *The Analogical Imagination,* Tracy has argued that undergirding and informing such "secondary" manifestations of Christian religious belief as creedal statements, liturgical formulae, and ethical codes of conduct, there exists what he terms "conceptual languages." Further, Tracy asserts that in the history of Western Christian thought, two quite distinctive "language traditions continue to function as the classic *theological* languages *par excellence.*" The "conceptual language" supporting the Roman Catholic theological tradition Tracy dubs "analogical language," a "language of ordered relationships articulating similarity-in-difference." In this language tradition, the Incarnation of Christ represents the focal event, the "primary analogue for the interpretation of the whole of reality." And because of this incarnational focal point in interpreting reality, "the entire world, the ordinary in all its variety, is now theologically envisioned as *sacrament*—a sacrament emanating from Jesus Christ as the paradigmatic sacrament of God, the paradigmatic clue to humanity and nature alike."[27] While Tracy posits that the distinctions and dissimilarities between "God" and "world" remain as real and tensive as the similarities in this analogical language, the emphasis in this c/Catholic tradition remains on "analogies in difference," which are expressed in a whole series of "ordered relationships . . . all established in and through reflection on the self's primordial experience of its similarity-in-difference to the [Incarnation] event." And the articulated analogues, based in the revelatory power of the constitutive event and its disclosure of radical, all-pervasive grace, are further developed into a literally, cosmic-

---

[26] Andrew Greeley, *The Catholic Myth: The Behavior and Beliefs of American Catholics* (New York: Scribner, 1990) chap. 3: "Do Catholics Imagine Differently?" 34–62; David Tracy, *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (New York: Crossroad, 1981) esp. 408 ff.

[27] Tracy, *Analogical Imagination* 412–13 (italics mine).

wide pattern of sacramental, analogical relationships between God and creation. With this all-pervasive grace, a fundamental trust and confidence in the goodness and sacramental nature of matter and history ultimately emerges, even in the face of absurdity and chaos: the created world embodies and sacramentally discloses the Holy, that same Holy who came fully and definitively in a human nature, Jesus.[28]

Over against this sacramentally-based language system, Tracy posits another conceptual language, namely "dialectical language." Theologians utilizing this language such as Luther, Kierkegaard, Barth, Bultmann, Niebuhr, and Tillich, insist on the necessity of radical *negation* in distinguishing the Holy from human culture in all authentically Christian language. That is, this language system posits a "rupture" between God's revelation of salvation and the human condition, a "rupture at the heart of human pretension, guilt and sin—a rupture disclosed in the absolute paradox of Jesus Christ proclaimed in the judging, negating, releasing word." This "word," of course, refers to both Jesus and to the secondary means of disclosing the Holy: over against "sacrament" in the analogical language system, this conceptual language focuses on the "preached word"—the word of judgement and of grace. And this "word" emphasizes not analogical similarity in difference, but rather Kierkegaard's "infinite qualitative difference" between this world and God's kingdom, between the human and the divine, between the historical Church and Christ's true disciples. Human communities utilizing this conceptual language tend not to emphasize their worship as the locus of God's sacramental presence; on the contrary, they rather tend to fear that they are always, potentially, an idolatrous source of oppressive power and overweening pride that must be resisted.[29]

And what the protesting/Protestant proclaimed word reveals as authentic Christian faith, the "second order" language of theology likewise emphasizes. Dialectical theology warns against all human efforts to save oneself, or to save human institutions; it witnesses to the "negation of all poisonous dreams of establishing any easy continuities between Christianity and culture"; it emphasizes the negation of all esthetic, ethical, and "pagan" possibilities that would lessen the fearsome divide between the world, and its institutions, and God.[30]

While Tracy's brilliant distinction between these two conceptual languages may appear, at least at first glance, somewhat disembodied and abstruse for the practical business of interpreting specific, quite embodied religious cultures, just the opposite is the case. As sociologist of religion

---

[28] Ibid. 410.   [29] Ibid. 414–15.
[30] Ibid. 415.

Andrew Greeley has argued, using the definitions of anthropologist Clifford Geertz, if all human religions are, at their most basic level, cultural systems that inspire certain moods and feelings in believers, feelings that offer explanations regarding the ultimate meanings of personal and collective human life, then the world views shaped by these cultural systems represent something like the hardware on which the software of creeds and liturgies operate. In Greeley's own words, "religion, both in the life of the individual and in the great historical traditions, was then experience, symbol, story (most symbols were inherently narrative) and community before it became creed, rite, and institution. The latter were essential, but derivative."[31] For Greeley then, glossing both Geertz and Tracy, the symbols and stories of the great religious systems, including Christianity, inspire distinctive "religious imaginations" that see the world through the lens of the narratives or symbols of the tradition. Onto this primary template of the imagination, institutions (derivatively if essentially) build theological systems, doctrines, and church structures. For Greeley, as for Tracy, the underlying "religious imagination" of any tradition remains primary (both in terms of epistemology as well as of chronology) to institutional forms:

Therefore, the fundamental differences between Catholicism and Protestantism are not doctrinal or ethical. The different propositional codes of the two heritages are but manifestations, tips of the iceberg, of more fundamentally differing sets of symbols. The Catholic ethic is "communitarian," and the Protestant "individualistic" because the preconscious "organizing" pictures of the two traditions that shape meaning and response to life for members of the respective heritages are different. Catholics and Protestants "*see*" the world differently.[32]

Greeley has therefore argued that the "Catholic imagination" tends to see society as a "sacrament" of God, a set of communitarian relationships governed by both justice and love, that reveals, however imperfectly, the presence of God. Human communities are thus both "natural" and "good," revealing sacramentally the divine pattern, and Greeley argues that precisely because communities are pictured by Catholics as sacramental, threats to communities must be resisted both by an assertion of communitarian/institutional values that promise to protect societies, and by strong support for doctrines on which the community is based. Greeley therefore asserts that Catholics are more likely than Protestants to value social over

[31] Geertz's definition of religion, which Greeley takes as axiomatic, is "a system of symbols which acts to establish powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations by formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic" (Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System," in his *The Interpretation of Cultures* [New York: Basic Books, 1973] 90). See also Greeley, *The Catholic Myth* 39.

[32] Greeley, *The Catholic Myth* 44.

individual relations; they are more likely than Protestants to value equality over freedom, because equality makes for smoother social relationships. And because of the sacramental/analogical nature of community itself, Greeley argues that the Catholic imagination emphasizes institutional, communal expressions of religious belief and organized, public piety.[33]

The "Protestant imagination," on the other hand, tends to see human society as both unnatural and oppressive, over against which the individual must break away and relate to the *Deus absconditus* as a completely free individual. Greeley therefore argues that Protestant societies, which picture the individual struggling for personal freedom against the sinful oppression of social networks, stress values and behaviors that contribute to strengthening personal freedom and independence from group control. Societies shaped by the Protestant imagination deplore vices that diminish personal integrity and individual rights; such societies valorize contracts and laws that protect individuals from one another. While the Catholic imagination for Greeley emphasizes the sanctity of communal relationships, the Protestant imagination emphasizes respect for the individual and concerns about social oppression.[34]

AN IMAGINATIVE APPROACH TO ALTERITY REAL AND IMAGINED

Both Tracy's understanding of pre-theological "conceptual languages," and Greeley's sociological application of that understanding to specific cultural stances, offer students of American culture potentially valuable resources for interpreting both the fact of, and contemporary interpretations of, Catholic alterity in contemporary American culture, as well as the relation of the new anti-Catholicism to what Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., once termed American culture's deepest bias. The very diffuseness of the Protestant impulse in American culture often hides the very real religious forces that shape our ostensibly secular society. But because those impulses are evanescent in no way makes them less real or powerful. Indeed, it might be argued that precisely the opposite is the case. The United States was, and to some extent still is, a culture powerfully shaped by the "dialectical imagination," in which it is believed that the individual must be protected from the encroaching oppressions of the community and its demands. In our Puritan-shaped culture, for both Catholics and Protestants, "hierarchy" more often than not means simply unelected officials rather than stewards of the community; tradition means more "the dead hand of the past" than an opportunity for creative application.

Perry Miller and Talcott Parsons were infallibly correct in discerning a

---

[33] Ibid. 46–48.   [34] Ibid. 48.

Protestant basis (if not bias) to the American cultural experiment. Their sense (and, ironically enough, probably Paul Blanshard's as well) that the Catholic imagination was somehow foreign to the American cultural experiment, even as late as the 21st century, might not be as historically misplaced as some contemporary public intellectuals would like us to think. Their sense that Catholics somehow see the world differently might not, in light of Tracy's insights, be as far-fetched as some older Catholic apologists claimed. The analogical language of mediation, community, and sacrament really does represent a different set of cultural emphases than the dialectical language of direct experience, individualism, and communal restraint. Will Herberg's famous pronouncement, in the midst of the "Fifties Revival," that Catholicism along with Judaism and Protestantism, at last represented one of three acceptable ways of "being American" was—like the announcement of Mark Twain's death—perhaps exaggerated as well as premature.[35]

The very diffuseness of the supposed new anti-Catholicism in the culture at large offers us a valuable clue to its lineage and energies. It would seem that many Americans in the media, the academy, and in popular culture perceive Catholicism to be different, and perhaps disturbingly different, from the American way of life, at least as that way of life can be understood to have religious values. And insofar as the different part of that perception goes, that may not be such a bad thing; indeed, for growing numbers of Catholic intellectuals, that is probably a good thing indeed.

From a Catholic point of view as well as from pluralist and multiculturalist ones, that difference might represent a good thing that should not be explained away or apologized for, but reveled in. The Catholic communitarian and sacramental tradition must account for the faith that is in it, but need not put up with anything remotely like religious prejudice in the public culture: Donovan and Weigel, it might be argued, yield salutary service in challenging aspects of North American culture that offend or trivialize Catholic sensibilities.

At the same time, however, Tracy has pointed out that the two conceptual languages he adumbrates are not in competition with each other. Still less did he want to imply that either was theologically superior to the other in disclosing the Holy. They are, rather, complementary conceptual languages, that complete and enrich each other. In his view, dialectical language needs the analogical to disclose and name the presence of the Holy in the world and in the community, and to off-set a dangerous tendency to valorize the individual; and analogical language needs the dialectical as a "firewall" against the idolatry of confusing human power plays with the activity of the Holy Spirit, or running rough-shod over individual rights in

---

[35] Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew,* esp. chaps. 5 and 7.

the name of communal identity. For Tracy, the analogical language of the Catholic tradition needs the healthy negations of the dialectical imagination to offset an idolatrous tendency toward univocally identifying the institutional symbol with the mystery celebrated. For as Tracy remind us, "negations of any claims to full adequacy (for example, any attempts at exhaustive, univocal meaning in any analogue) are negations to assure that the similarities remain similarities-in-difference. The negations function as principles of intensification constituted by the tensive event-character of the focal meaning to negate any slackening of the sense of radical mystery."[36] Indeed, any attempts to force out all tensions from analogical language ends in destroying that conceptual language. This insight is especially important for an institution claiming such a sacramental/communal language as its own, for the iron law of bureaucracy tends toward heightening the similarities between the Church and Christ's true flock, and flattening out the tensive quality of sacramental revelation. But such a collapsing of tension will not do, Tracy notes, for

Where theologically exact, the resultant order is never purchased at the price of either intensity or variety. Any harmony present in the order is never forced (never, for example, cheaply affirmative). . . The presence of the negations continue in the real similarities articulated as similarities-in-difference. For these reasons, the major explicitly analogical traditions in theology have correctly insisted that in the theological use of analogies, dissimilarities between God and world are as great as the similarities: the *via eminentiae* is possible only on condition of its constant fidelity to the *via negationis.*[37]

Tracy's limning of these two "conceptual languages" in Western Christianity might help us to understand in a sophisticated theological way some of the sources for what is perceivd to be, and to some extent is, the latent anti-Catholicism in contemporary North American culture, as well as its relation to the 300-year old tradition of America's "deepest bias." That sense of Catholic "differentness" might very well turn out to be what saves the Catholic tradition from being swallowed up by what G. K. Chesterton termed "a land too easily loved."

But Tracy's recognition of the complementary nature of the two imaginations might likewise help Catholics to hear honest critiques of the institutional Church without automatically hanging all of them on the "anti-Catholic" hook. Honest critics of what *does,* in some cases, look very much like a problematic collpasing of the tension between God's will and the Church's laws in the name of "protecting the community," might offer a salutary caution to Catholics who are perhaps too sanguine in trusting the leaders of the community in their zeal to "smooth out the differences"

[36] Tracy, *Analogical Imagination* 409.   [37] Ibid. 408–9.

between ecclesial and cultural responsibilities. Catholics in the U.S.—like all other citizens—have been profoundly shaped by the dialectical imagination in the very process of growing up in the culture and accepting its values: suspicion of communal oppression of the individual is part and parcel of being a citizen in our culture (for good and for ill).[38]

Tracy's insights can help the Catholic community to recognize the coherence and value of its mediated, sacramental, and communal tradition in a culture based in a somewhat different "conceptual language." His insights can likewise serve as an intellectual framework for Catholic apologists engaged in challenging critics—both new and old, both religious and "secular"—who would denigrate such a theology in our pluralist and now multiculturalist society. But his insights might also help us to sort out real from perceived biases both within and outside the community, and help us to live a little more comfortably with tensions within the community and between the community and modern culture that can not (and probably should not) be answered from the argument from authority: "do this because I told you to." For Tracy has shown that the analogical needs the tension created by the dialectical imagination for its own communal integrity, and for clarifying the "communal" from the "institutionally oppressive"—for "the order is never purchased at the price of either intensity or variety."

---

[38] Perry Miller, *Nature's Nation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1963).