

A CATHOLIC UNDERSTANDING OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Tricia C. Bruce

COMMUNICATING CATHOLIC CULTURE requires *knowing* Catholic culture. How do we come to know Catholic culture? What tools are at our disposal to understand the people, institutions, and systems of meaning that together comprise Catholic culture(s)? These questions turn us toward the methodological and epistemological strengths of social science to ascertain 'truths' (with a small 't'), empirically. Social science enables us to read culture, understand culture, and recognise cultural change. While it proceeds according to different methods, logics, and aims, it is not inherently incompatible with those of faith. A 'Catholic understanding' of social science—and a social scientific understanding of Catholicism—embeds mutual respect for the relevance of faith *and* reason to all people and the social worlds they inhabit. This essay takes seriously this mutual respect, with an eye toward dialogue and understanding born of knowledge and empathy.

A disclaimer and a few words of positioning: I am a sociologist, not a theologian. I am a graduate of all public schools, not Catholic ones. I am a trained social scientist, not a trained or ordained minister. My personal commitments and passions as a sociologist have led me into deep sociological study of Catholicism and, in particular, American Catholics and the US Catholic Church. This has generated scholarly publications including the books: *American Parishes: Remaking Local Catholicism*; *Parish and Place: Making Room for Diversity in the American Catholic Church*; *Polarization in the*

US Catholic Church: Naming the Wounds; Beginning to Heal and *Faithful Revolution: How Voice of the Faithful Is Changing the Church.*¹ I speak here to a social scientific understanding of Catholicism without purporting to speak officially of or for a Catholic understanding of social science, alone. Sociology is necessarily a collective endeavour, as is Catholicism.

The sociological perspective—infused by what C. Wright Mills famously coined ‘the sociological *imagination*’—offers a conduit between the Catholic Intellectual Tradition and contemporary culture.² A sociology of *Catholicism* takes seriously two truths: (1) the relevance of a distinctively Catholic religious sensibility and (2) the empirical grounding of the social world. From these truths grows the recognition and measurement of what the late priest-sociologist and author Andrew Greeley called *The Catholic Imagination*, ‘one that views the world and all that is in it as enchanted, haunted by the Holy Spirit and the presence of grace.’³ More hauntingly, the synthesis of perspectives casts a shadow of ‘sociological noir,’ the term sociologist Kieran Flanagan uses to describe our attentiveness to ‘inconvenient matters so capriciously disregarded’ such as those found ‘in the darkness of modernity’ including legacies of sin and suffering.⁴ These are not always happy truths that social scientists find, in other words, but they are there whether or not we measure, see, and attend to them.

The sociological imagination embeds a promise; so, too, does the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. The promise (and task) of the sociological imagination, Mills tells us, is that it ‘enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society.’⁵ It links people to society as a whole, recognising that an ‘I’ is just as much a ‘we.’ The promise of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition is that faith and reason are not mutually exclusive nor extrinsic to one another, but reciprocal. Its quest and revelations are accompanied by intent and direction; its conclusions are not innocuous but worthy of dialogue and practical action.

Both of these promises—that of the sociological imagination and that of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition—synthesise otherwise disjointed hermeneutics to deliver an improved, integrated approach to understanding social worlds. And, like all promises, both are imbued with moral intent: a normative 'should' informing *how* and *why* to approach questions about the social world in this way. The work of social science and social scientists must take seriously its own presuppositions, commitments, and teleological ends.⁶ This is not positivist, value-neutral territory, even as trained social scientists necessarily approach their methodology to reduce bias and accurately capture empirical truths. Positionality matters, but not in isolation: its relevance lies in what questions are pursued and the broader moral projects that findings carry among audiences who hear them. The norms of social science guide *how* studies are done; their synthesis within the Catholic Intellectual Tradition invites dialogue as to *why* and *for what*.

What promises spawn from joining the sociological imagination with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition in studies of the social world, in attempts to know Catholic culture? What is the promise of these two promises? It is that *history, biography, reason, and faith* can be helpfully intertwined as a means of reading and knowing society and the people in it. It is a path of *knowledge, empathy, and dialogue* that is superior to avoidance, ignorance, misinformation, and apathy. It is a path to understanding and sharing Catholic culture in dialogue with the contemporary world.

This chapter forewarns neither enchantment nor shadows, but illumination as a precursor to communication. It holds that linking the sociological imagination with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition uncovers an enriched perspective on the Church, Catholicism, Catholics, and human persons in the contemporary world. Specifically, it assesses the promise of pairing the sociological imagination with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition to the most local, formal organisational unit of the Catholic Church: the parish. I

have seen personally the synergy and promise that comes through sociological study of the parish, as it has occupied my attention in recent scholarship. Lessons from this focus on the parish lead into three premises of a paired promise for a wide array of applications, pursued in the interest of knowing (and thereby communicating) Catholic culture. I conclude with a call for future work re-envisioned through the paired promise—and responsibility—of this approach.

A Paired Promise Realised in Sociological Studies of the Parish

Given its role as activator, tether, and intermediary between local Catholics and a global Catholic church, the Catholic parish—and parishes overall—provide a powerful demonstration of the promise realised in synthesising the sociological imagination with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. The parish is a site of cultural production, appropriation, and communication. It is at once an organic and agency-driven, grassroots manifestation of Catholic faith and a highly authoritative, structurally beset, regulated manifestation of that same Catholic faith. As I wrote with my coauthors in our introduction to *American Parishes*, the parish is 'not solely the product of divine sources but also social ones,' inhabiting the intersection of community, geography, and authority.⁷ Querying the parish through social science methodologies 'can tell us what people are.'⁸

Social scientists' attempts to assess Catholic cultures via the parish, however, reveal an uneven history and receptivity—one that links to Catholic leaders' skepticism or uncertainty toward hearing about empirical data on Catholics. It has taken time to appreciate the promise of the sociological imagination alongside that of faith. The history of social scientific parish studies draws attention to tensions between the 'academy' and the Church. Elsewhere I have summarised this contentious history of the sociological study of parishes, noting how 'Then and now, the sociology of parishes posed a dual-constituency value proposition':

good for the academy, good for the Church.⁹ But, all too often, the practical unfolding of it, instead 'setting up sociology as a problem-naming science' and, therefore, 'sociology (and sociologists) as problem generating.'¹⁰

Notable in this historical re-telling of parish studies is the pre-Vatican II research of sociologist-priest Joseph Fichter, whose in-depth research into a single parish in New Orleans, Louisiana, catalysed a contemporary approach to parish studies.¹¹ Among the findings of Fichter's study were revelations that the Catholic laity's beliefs and behaviours did not neatly align with those pronounced by priests during homilies each week or promulgated by Catholic hierarchy on behalf of a universal Church. There were both active Catholics and inactive ones; Catholics who upheld and abided by core teachings of the faith and Catholics who wore the religious identity but not corollary implications for behaviour. Catholics, it turned out, didn't always like the homilies of parish priests, nor heed their advice when making decisions about personal and family lives. This imperfect alignment between the culture of 'the Church' and that of 'lay Catholics'—illuminated through a sociological examination of the parish—may not be particularly surprising to us today given its resonance with contemporary studies. But in 1951, Fichter's book roiled many Catholic leaders for its daring introduction of empirical data into conversations about faith. Better to separate faith from reason and sociology from Catholicism, it seemed: the news otherwise was not the most welcome. In using the methodology of social science to identify empirical patterns, sociologists seemed to be *causing* the problems. Fichter's own superior successfully petitioned to suppress subsequent volumes of his groundbreaking study on parishes.

The promise of the sociological imagination synthesised with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition was rescued (and perhaps Fichter even vindicated) by later affirmations of social science within the documents of the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965). Specifically, *Gaudium et spes* ('On the

Church in the Modern World') acknowledged then-tensions between faith and science, noting how 'many of our contemporaries seem to fear that a closer bond between human activity and religion will work against the independence of men, of societies, or of the sciences.'¹² It deplored 'habits of mind, which are sometimes found too among Christians, which do not sufficiently attend to the rightful independence of science and which, from the arguments and controversies they spark, lead many minds to conclude that faith and science are mutually opposed.'¹³ But rather than retreat into one or other, the Conciliar document instead set forth the notion that faith and (social) science need *not* be opposed, but that 'if methodical investigation within every branch of learning is carried out in a genuinely scientific manner and in accord with moral norms, it never truly conflicts with faith, for earthly matters and the concerns of faith derive from the same God.'¹⁴ Allowing for history, biography, reason, faith—a.k.a. a Catholic approach to social science—could 'not only bring men hope of improved self-knowledge; in conjunction with technical methods, they are helping men exert direct influence on the life of social groups.'¹⁵ Moreover, pastoral care incorporating 'secular sciences, especially of psychology and sociology' is imperative 'so that the faithful may be brought to a more adequate and mature life of faith.'¹⁶

Gaudium et spes further credits social scientists' quest to unveil the underlying 'stability, truth, goodness, proper laws and order' of things, saying that:

Indeed whoever labours to penetrate the secrets of reality with a humble and steady mind, even though he is unaware of the fact, is nevertheless being led by the hand of God, who holds all things in existence, and gives them their identity.¹⁷

Social scientists, as such, are labourers who penetrate the secrets of reality. Their work is part of a larger moral project. Classic social theorist Georg Simmel likewise compelled the exploration of secrets¹⁸; social scientists are empowered to

communicate the secrets of social realities to a broader audience.¹⁹

The approach validated by *Gaudium et spes* set a trajectory for what transpired henceforth among social scientific efforts to examine Catholic cultures in the parish. The document forecast also the relevance of positionality and connection to larger moral projects, ideas drawing special attention once the sociology of Catholicism moved from the primary purview of social scientifically trained priests and women religious to Catholic lay people and even non-Catholic scholars following Vatican II. Pope St John Paul II's later reception to this approach paired a respect for social science with scepticism toward its implicit normativity. On this, Robert Royal summarises that the insights of social science 'provide information on which faith and reason must reflect in order to integrate them fully into a properly unified Christian world view' and that 'All cultures contain truths mixed with errors, and it is one of the tasks of a properly understood reason to sift those cultures for what they can bring to the faith and what the faith can bring to them.'²⁰ Penetrating the aforementioned 'secrets of reality,' in other words, social scientists undoubtedly disclose troubling truths. This is where social scientific methodology transcends positionality and findings grant opportunities to foster broader moral projects, mutually conceived.

The sociological study of parishes has uncovered many secrets of reality in and among Catholic cultures. Contemporary studies have engaged the paired promise of the sociological imagination with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, contributing to dialogue and enriching our understanding of the Church, Catholics, and humans in the world.

We have learned, for example, that many of today's parishes are necessarily merged, clustered, or 'supersized' as a means of accommodating more (and more geographically dispersed) Catholics, with fewer available priests.²¹ Dioceses in the Northeast and Midwest United States, for example, face monumental decisions on how best to con-

tract an infrastructure built long ago to accommodate a more densely concentrated urban Catholic population. Dioceses in the South and West US, by contrast, expand to keep up with population growth in new areas, but often without sufficient numbers of priests to serve them. Parish leadership has necessarily shifted from the nearly exclusive realm of priests to that of permanent deacons and (often unpaid) lay leaders. Parishes now operate largely as the collaborative project of the unordained and varyingly trained even as they must still answer to the codified norms of canon law and oversight of a local bishop.

The practical reallocation of leadership at the most local level from the ordained to the non-ordained is also meaningful for its implications regarding authority and power in the Church. Sociological explorations reveal myriad ways in which lay Catholics engage in 'interpretative autonomy'²² as a central component of their commitment to a shared religious tradition. Catholicism viewed through the sociological perspective—alongside faith and reason—is not one of top-down doctrinal delivery and bottom-up adherence but one of doctrinal reflexivity and cultural production. Flipping this script of 'Church' and how it is lived in practice 'emphasises awareness of the social as opposed to the natural or divine construction of doctrine,' says sociologist Michele Dillon, leaving room for both persons and parishes 'to interrogate traditions for clues, symbols, and ideas that might legitimate an emancipatory agenda.'²³ In other words, holistic teachings and institutional structures of the Catholic Church are contended with through the change-oriented agency of lay Catholics together in parishes. This may take the form of activism that privileges changes to personal lifestyle above comprehensive systems under the purview of Catholic hierarchy, as Maureen Day shows in *Catholic Activism Today*.²⁴ Or it could take the form of Catholics recalling and rejecting elements of Catholic liturgy to carve out compatible identities such as Black Catholics who negotiate painful past exclusion from the

Church 'by sifting in elements of the African American religious experience and Roman Catholic tradition to produce a unique black Catholic cultural identity.'²⁵ These kinds of activities—viewed from the ground-up through the methods of social science—harken a reconceptualisation of who and what is Church at every level.

We have also learned about how today's Catholic parishes (and the dioceses that piece them together within wider community fabrics) become laboratories for encounters with the increasing cultural diversity. Sometimes such encounters are avoided: despite Gospel messages to the contrary, parishes are even more segregated racially and socioeconomically than the neighbourhoods they inhabit.²⁶ In other examples, 'personal parishes' revitalise the older national parish model to strengthen community among similarly situated Catholics.²⁷ Dioceses and bishops make room for diversity by ensuring that parishes act as both generalist and specialist organisations. But, more commonly, internal diversity clashes with the aforementioned trend of declines in vocation and supersized parishes. This means that contemporary parishes do not generate a single, unified community worshiping together but a multicultural tableau with many Mass times in many languages. Parishes display uneven efforts to incorporate a multitude of traditions and cultural preferences embraced by specialised groups of Catholics. 'Shared parishes' blend one or more cultural communities under a single parish roof—often-times whites and Hispanics/Latinos.²⁸ While strategies of assimilation have been largely replaced by those of inclusion, parishes and their leaders frequently find themselves bereft of the resources and tools required for effective inclusivity. Seminaries now train priests in language and cultural competencies; vocations grow slowly among minority Catholic groups to shift the racial demographic of parish leadership. International priests, too, fill gaps left by both the priest shortage and the changing racial demo-

graphics of lay Catholics. But inequalities alongside the dynamics of power and inclusion persist.

Sociological considerations of parishes also reveal them as places where Catholics actively negotiate what it means to be Catholic, the meaning of a local Catholic community, and shared narratives for belonging. Jerome Baggett in *Sense of the Faithful* interviewed hundreds of Catholics belonging to six Catholic parishes in northern California to assess 'nonofficial' viewpoints in the pews and revelations of religion as 'repertoires of symbols that specifically represent what is taken to be sacred.'²⁹ Such religious cultures, Baggett tells us, are available at a societal level, appropriated at the individual level, and allocated at the organizational level—via parishes. Parishes 'are institutional carriers of the religious meanings embedded in the symbolic repertoire that is the Catholic tradition, but not every parish does this in the same way.'³⁰ Even as Catholicism unifies a shared tradition globally and bureaucratizes this through legal-rational measures, culturally it is lived out and embraced differently by different Catholics—albeit together. Parishioners choose from an array of ways to live out their religious identities. 'Tacit discursive rules' guide the nature of discussions within Catholic parishes. Catholic traditions are subject to investigation; Catholic 'insiders' innovate.

Diverse Catholic parish cultures leads inevitability to divergence and disagreement on a broader scale. Polarisation infuses parishes and the Catholic Church as a whole, inhibiting dialogue: we know this because this, too, is among the secrets of reality that social scientists uncover.³¹ An in-depth study of religious orientations in two parishes led sociologist Mary Ellen Konieczny to conclude that Catholics anchor themselves in a shared tradition but 'emphasise different religious beliefs and practices' and, consequently, pass on a fragmented tradition—'incomplete because some aspects of the tradition have been delegitimised in these local cultures, are not practised, or not known.'³² This fragmentation and compartmentalisation

bleeds into broader moral polarisation across American society: born not solely of individual attitudes nor elites within large-scale institutions but of local religious cultures. These empirical truths, too, are part of learning and communicating the relevance of Catholic cultures.

Penetrating the secrets of reality of all cultures, including Catholicism, necessitates looking beyond the uppermost layer and within that which is hidden upon first glance. Social scientists who study parishes reveal versions of truth that, while perhaps troubling and even contradictory, invite dialogue and strategic next steps for those who take them seriously. These are among the secrets that sociological studies of Catholicism reveal. Some news is 'better' than others, audience and intention dependent. But all is a route to knowledge of Catholic cultures—internally varied, divergent, and 'errantly' judged as they may be.

Premises of a Paired Promise

As with studies of the parish, the paired promise of the sociological imagination intertwined with the Catholic Intellectual Tradition portends great insight when predicated on shared premises. The following premises convey simple but imperative foundations for utilising social science to know and communicate Catholic cultures.

First, a Catholic approach to social science (as with a social scientific approach to Catholicism) takes *faith* seriously, alongside the norms of scientific research. A well-executed sociological study of Catholicism does not work to explain away Catholicism as merely the byproduct of something else. None of the studies summarised here conclude with the errancy of religious belief or those who adhere to it, nor with its ultimate insignificance for identities and lived behaviours. By contrast: faith is a social fact, even as it is realised differently or collectively challenged and reappropriated. The end goal of social science is not to identify the variable that renders religion null. It is to study the properties of the social fabric, including Catholic cultures.

Second, a Catholic approach to social science (as with a social scientific approach to Catholicism) necessarily recognises the collective as embedded in the person and the person as embedded in the collective. These are core tenets of both social science and the Catholic Intellectual Tradition: the interwovenness of the 'I' and the 'we.' Parishes illustrate powerfully the reasons we cannot examine the micro (individual) level without attention to the meso (organisational) and macro (institutional and big picture) levels of social realities. Catholicism as a whole is fertile ground for exploring the interplay of structure and agency, particularly given Catholics' penchant for internalising traditional messages alongside local inculturation and lay agency. These premises are compatible and reinforcing in both social science and Catholicism, and thus especially promising for interrogating and communicating Catholic culture.

Third, the paired promise described in these pages necessarily embeds a set of norms and direction that merit disclosure and discussion. It is disingenuous to describe the 'promise' of either social science and the Catholic Intellectual Tradition as absolved of positionality or moral intent. Better to ask what broader dialogue such work contributes to, how it will be received, and what difference it can make. This is not to undermine scientific norms but to recognise potential perils alongside promises. These are not benign endeavours. Questions of morality be treated with attention and care, not ignored. Social scientists can ask why and for whom they study what they do, even as they employ the highest standards of their discipline to uncover valid truths. Advancing the normative goals of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition does not bypass those of social science. In this, methodology and application transcend positionality, that is, it is better to dialogue about *how a study is done* and *how its findings are used* rather than leveling blind criticism at *who* is conducting it based upon discipline and positionality alone.

Conclusion

Catholic cultures—like all cultures—are changing, and rapidly so. This does not come as a surprise; *Gaudium et spes* foreshadowed this:

The circumstances of the life of modern man have been so profoundly changed in their social and cultural aspects, that we can speak of a new age of human history. New ways are open, therefore, for the perfection and the further extension of culture. These ways have been prepared by the enormous growth of natural, human and social sciences, by technical progress, and advances in developing and organizing means whereby men can communicate with one another.³³

We cannot know, understand, or dialogue about these changes without leveraging the tools of social science and heeding the information it provides. This is what it means to pair the promises of the sociological imagination with those of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition. Naivety and ignorance do not lead to Truth or Goodness; denial promotes neither 'truth' nor Truth.

How might the contemporary Catholic Church, those who lead it, and those who actively participate in its culture envision their role in this dialogue? It is clear that ignoring, suppressing, or brandishing as flawed the lessons of social science are not paths to effective dialogue. Listening and discerning is a better tack, as is evaluating methodology alongside positionality and intent under the purview of broader moral projects. It takes applying faith and reason and the sociological imagination to see the ways in which *all* Catholics apply faith and reason when living out their religious lives collectively, within the parish and beyond. A Catholic understanding of social sciences does not run away from this realisation. It starts with it as a foundational premise.

There are limits to this approach, of course. Social Science has its blind spots. Methodology involves a series of strategic choices; those choices are necessarily disclosed

and critiqued through peer review. Empirical studies revealing secrets about reality can be difficult to receive amid believed Truths about those same realities. It may be tempting to set aside conclusions deemed incompatible or emphasise the most optimistic of outcomes. But these challenges, too, are part of this paired promise: intertwining history, biography, reason, and faith on a path toward knowledge, empathy, and dialogue.

What responsibility comes from pairing the promise of the sociological imagination—to see the 'I' in the 'we' and the 'we' in the 'I'—with that of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition, accepting faith and reason as mutually enhancing? It is to treat what one finds—those secrets of reality—with respect and care, through filters of both faith and reason. It is not to dismiss social scientific findings as falsehoods or inconvenient truths, nor to blame the bearer of 'bad news.' It is instead to proceed with faith that reason need not threaten dialogue but enhance it. *Seeing and knowing* Catholic culture is a precursor to *communicating* Catholic culture. Better to know the empirical world as it is than pretend that it exists is it doesn't. This is the paired promise—and responsibility—afforded by a Catholic understanding of social sciences.

Notes

- ¹ G. J. Adler, T. C. Bruce, and B. Starks, eds., *American Parishes: Remaking Local Catholicism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019); T. C. Bruce, *Parish and Place: Making Room for Diversity in the American Catholic Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017); M. E. Konieczny, C. Camosy, and T. C. Bruce, eds., *Polarization in the US Catholic Church: Naming the Wounds, Beginning to Heal* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2016); T. C. Bruce, *Faithful Revolution: How Voice of the Faithful Is Changing the Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014[2011]).
- ² C. W. Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000 [1959]).
- ³ A. Greeley. *The Catholic Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), p. 184.

- 4 K. Flanagan, *Sociological Noir: Irruptions and the Darkness of Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2017), p. 1.
- 5 Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, p. 6.
- 6 C. Smith, *The Sacred Project of American Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).
- 7 Adler, Bruce, Starks, eds., *American Parishes*, p. 3.
- 8 T. Bruce, 'A Brief History of Sociology and Parishes in the United States' in *American Parishes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019), p. 41.
- 9 Bruce, 'A Brief History,' p. 25.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- 11 J. H. Fichter, *The Dynamics of a City Church* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951).
- 12 Vatican II, *Gaudium et spes*, 36.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 62.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 36.
- 18 G. Simmel, *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. K. H. Wolff (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1950).
- 19 T. Bruce, 'The 2019 H. Paul Douglass Lecture: I Can't Keep Quiet: Engaging with Scholarly Research on Religion' in *Review of Religious Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13644-019-00393-y> (2019).
- 20 R. Royal, *A Deeper Vision: The Catholic Intellectual Tradition in the Twentieth Century* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2015), p. 256.
- 21 C. E. Zech, M. L. Gautier, M. M. Gray, J. L. Wiggins, T. P. Gaunt, SJ, *Catholic Parishes of the 21st Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).
- 22 M. Dillon, *Catholic Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- 23 *Ibid.*, p. 25.
- 24 M. Day, *Catholic Activism Today* (New York: New York University Press, 2020).
- 25 T. Pratt, 'Liturgy as Identity Work in Predominantly African American Parishes' in *American Parishes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019), p. 149–50.
- 26 M. J. Bane, 'A House Divided' in *American Parishes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019), p. 153–170.
- 27 T. Bruce, *Parish and Place*.
- 28 B. Hoover, *The Shared Parish: Latinos, Anglos, and the Future of U.S. Catholicism* (New York: New York University Press, 2014).

²⁹ J. Baggett, *Sense of the Faithful: How Americans Live Their Faith* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

³¹ M. E. Konieczny, C. Camosy, and T. C. Bruce, eds., *Polarization in the US Catholic Church*.

³² M. E. Konieczny, *The Spirit's Tether* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 244, 249.

³³ Vatican II, *Gaudium et spes*, 54.