The Public Character of the University-Related Divinity School

Principal writers for the University-Related Divinity School Study Group:
Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, Vanderbilt University Divinity School
Robin W. Lovin, Perkins School of Theology Southern Methodist University
Richard J. Wood, Yale University Divinity School

ABSTRACT: This article will describe the social and historical location that provides the context for university-related theological education and then explore three distinctive elements of a university divinity school's public voice and presence: (1) a new opening for theological scholarship in contemporary intellectual life, (2) an ecumenical and interreligious dialogue that reflects the diversity of the university community and the theological school, and (3) a collaboration with other disciplines and professional schools that provides a more comprehensive view of key issues for the human future. In this third area, especially, university-related theological schools must relate to the university as a primary public as one means to reach the larger public.

What is the appropriate public role for the university-situated divinity school? In what ways should theological education within a university attend to and influence social, political, and moral issues that shape the school, the students educated within the school, and the community in which the school is located? While university divinity schools share many features with other types of theological schools, they also occupy a unique position that offers both opportunity and challenge. They are subject to the same cultural forces that make it difficult for all theological schools to maintain a public presence at the end of the twentieth century, but they also have unique possibilities as a result of their location in modern research universities.

Much has been written in recent years on the relationship between faith and scholars and on the public voice of religion.[1] This literature provided the background for many of the discussions in the working group of university-related divinity schools that is part of the Project on the Public Character of Theological Education. This article, however, is not intended as a contribution to that literature. Here, we focus on the ways in which these changes affect university theological schools in particular, and on the constructive responses that are possible in a university context. While university-related schools are situated in a context that is irreducibly public, the implications of claims about

public theology for theological education still need to be more carefully articulated.

The University Context

In a way, the companion articles in this issue on Evangelical, Mainline, and Roman Catholic theological education resemble "position papers" or "mission statements." They define fundamental presuppositions, key religious beliefs, and distinct religious patterns that are shaped by the traditions that these theological schools serve. As one might expect, theological concepts such as "conversionism," "social commitment," and "sacramentality" shape the kinds of answers given to the question of the public nature of theological education in Evangelical, Mainline, and Roman Catholic seminaries.

By contrast, university divinity schools typically lack this confessional consensus. With faculty of increasingly diverse religious persuasions and a student body equally diverse in both background and vocational aspirations, most university divinity schools cannot draw on a particular religious tradition to shape their understanding of their own public presence. Instead, as diversity among faculty and students has intensified in the last few decades, university divinity schools birthed the idea of the importance of "public theology" as a sort of substitute for confessional identity. Discussion of "public theology" or "public religion" functioned within these schools as a way to articulate consensus about their complex role in society and their mission in theological education.

The faculty and students within university-related divinity schools have not always been so inclusive as the language of public theology might suggest. To risk oversimplification, the four working groups in this ATS initiative to explore the public character of theological education actually comprise one Catholic group and three variations on Protestantism—evangelical, mainline, and university schools. The oldest and most visible university-related divinity schools have Protestant roots and, roughly speaking, these schools have evolved through three general stages, from an initial Protestant liberalism at the beginning of the twentieth century, through Protestant ecumenism in the 1950s and '60s, to the current move toward a more genuinely inter-religious theological education in the 1990s.

This evolution is most clear in the four university schools—Yale, Harvard, Chicago, and Vanderbilt—that are now non-denominational. Each began as a bastion of Protestantism, with formal or informal ties to particular denominational traditions, whether Puritan/Congregational, Unitarian, Baptist, or Methodist. They sought independent status as a means to greater academic freedom and, as important, in a move to benefit from nonsectarian support. James H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt's second chancellor, for example, shepherded a split from Methodist control in 1914 in a bid for national recognition and Rockefeller,

Carnegie, and Vanderbilt funds designated for institutions independent of ecclesiastical governance.

To be sure, this was not a one-directional movement. Some universities, notably Emory and Southern Methodist University, founded theological schools expressly to maintain the denominational connections that Vanderbilt had severed. Others found ways to maintain academic freedom along with confessional commitment. Catholic theological schools affiliated with universities followed their own path, shaped by the changes wrought at Vatican II and controversies over the meaning of the church's magisterium, as well as by the cultural tendency toward increasingly secular education that affected their Protestant counterparts.

A trend toward religious diversity is also apparent across the variety of institutional arrangements. Faculties that only a few decades ago were largely composed of white, Protestant males now reflect a rich variety of perspectives, not only in terms of religious beliefs but also in terms of gender, race, and ethnic backgrounds. The initial addition of Catholic faculty is now augmented by the push to establish other arenas of expertise, such as Jewish, Islamic, or Native American. Granted, most institutions are far from non-Christian in either make-up or constituency. They still harbor a predilection to put Protestant Christian traditions into conversation with these "other" traditions. But they are far removed from the Protestant institutions that they once were.

Schools like Vanderbilt or Yale still attract students from particular denominational constituencies, but they are now likely to draw students from a great variety of Christian and non-Christian traditions as well. University divinity schools in general are particularly attractive to persons either unaffiliated with a particular tradition or actively disenfranchised from a tradition, either through some kind of personal or religious crisis or by doctrines within the tradition itself, with non-ordination of women being a prime example. Students ranging from very conservative believers to agnostic seekers are attracted by the academic reputations of these schools and by the opportunity to grapple seriously with fundamental religious questions in a context free from tight normative or doctrinal horizons or boundaries.

Weekly worship is sometimes the most revealing place where varying religious commitments come into tension. While these institutions usually still hold weekly services, the worship committee might include a Baptist, an atheist, a Jew, an Episcopalian contemplating Catholicism, and an African Methodist Episcopal minister.[2] In the classroom itself, religious commitments and intellectual exploration are not seen as mutually exclusive. Indeed, open and critical examination is said to lead to a more authentic grasp of faith. Even those divinity schools that maintain denominational ties do not teach exclusively from a confessional point of view. This is particularly true in Canada, where access to government funding for theological education has encouraged university affiliations and consortial arrangements in which theological schools

maintain a distinctive denominational identity while providing instruction to students across the ecumenical spectrum.

As a result of their mixture of denominational and university histories, university theological schools reflect some of the problems that have characterized both institutional contexts. In particular, the historically Protestant schools have been impacted by the decline of mainstream Protestantism. While most have been somewhat successful in expanding their denominational base and the range of vocational preparation they provide, they have not changed the public perception of their identification with mainline Protestantism. They share its decline of broader cultural influence.

In addition, the university-related theological schools have been affected by changes in higher education. While their history goes back to the beginnings of higher education in North America, their present situation is shaped particularly by the development of the modern research university from the late nineteenth century onward. They have experienced—in addition to the particular questions this context addresses to religious belief—the general problems of humanistic studies in finding a place for themselves in an environment dominated by the hard sciences. The humanities in general have had to face criticism of their "ivory tower" status and the seeming irrelevance of abstract intellectualizing to the pressing problems of the broader society. The question of public character and public presence, which dominates the introspection of the divinity schools, is, in fact, a question faced by other scholars across the boundaries of university disciplines, particularly those disciplines less obviously promoting the technological, economic infrastructures of postindustrial capitalism.

In spite of these problems, the university context offers notable benefits as a location for theological scholarship. The visibility of major universities makes the task of public presence somewhat easier for university-related schools. Being in a university facilitates and even forces a public voice by bringing to the theological school name recognition and media access greater than freestanding schools. The media and political leaders tend to call upon known schools and recognized faculty for comment and advice. Most university-based theological schools also have particular opportunities for interdisciplinary and interprofessional discourse. The presence of professional schools, such as law, medicine, and nursing, and other departments, such as anthropology, philosophy, and political science, offer the chance to address the public through the complex public already represented by the university itself.

On this score, perhaps the most noteworthy observation about the current context of the university-related divinity school is a relatively positive change in the cultural climate as increasingly receptive to the possible contributions of religion scholars and increasingly hospitable to religious institutions.[3] This welcoming attitude is by no means universal, but the days are gone when scientism reduced religious beliefs to childish delusions, academic norms

excluded consideration of religious beliefs, and separation of church and state left no place for the contributions of faith communities to public life.

The emergence of the research university into a postmodern intellectual milieu, in which the Enlightenment and positivist presuppositions of its search for knowledge have been called into question, creates a new and more hopeful intellectual environment for the university-related theological school. This climate opens up new possibilities for a public presence for these schools. At the same time that university theological schools find themselves marginalized in a wider public that sees them simply as part of a declining empire of mainstream Protestantism, the opening discourse across methodological and disciplinary boundaries within the university creates an important new public for the theological school. In other words, university-related divinity schools have a demanding "public" to address right within their own universities. While this university public is not the only public that university-related schools need to consider, it is an increasingly important one.

Theological Scholarship

On the basis of this brief survey of the context of university-related theological education, we may return to the three elements of the university divinity school's public voice that we identified at the beginning of this essay. First, there is the new openness to religious ideas in the university and, as a result, the distinctive contribution that theological scholarship can make to contemporary intellectual life.

Theological scholarship remains the central enterprise of university-based divinity schools. For the better part of the twentieth century this scholarship, in all its varieties, struggled for acceptance in a scientific, critical intellectual culture, and especially in the environment of the research university. Until quite recently, the Enlightenment myth of value-free, completely objective intellectual inquiry significantly undermined scholarship that started from a religiously committed position. The hyper-scientific approach to scholarship marginalized and privatized religious faith, interpreting it as an expression of personal preference or community practice with little or no importance for public choices or the academic search for truth. Religious beliefs and practices, it was held, had no role in so-called "objective" inquiry.

As the prior section observed, this myth has been significantly undermined in recent years. Leading secular philosophers, such as Wilfred Sellars and Richard Rorty, feminist theorists, such as Evelyn Fox Keller and Sandra Harding, as well as historians of science, such as Thomas Kuhn, have established that the relationship between careful observation, rich description, and the values that govern choices about what is observed and described is extremely complex.[4] While objectivity has not been entirely debunked as a proper perspective for academic study, understandings of intellectual objec-

tivity have shifted to include the impact of context, location, community, traditions, and beliefs on the achievement of objective knowledge.[5] If objectivity is a goal that inquiry approaches, therefore, and not a starting point, theological scholarship has the potential to be as "objective" in this sense as any other field of disciplined inquiry.

This pervasive change in the modern intellectual climate opens up space for the public presence and voice of scholars in university-related theological schools, but it also multiplies the audiences to whom they must attempt, often simultaneously, to speak. Characteristically, university-situated schools are involved, in varying ways, in both the professional education of ministers and in the academic education of Ph.D. students. The ability to participate in doctoral teaching then is an important dimension of the selection and hiring of faculty. Some schools have primary responsibility for staffing and administering doctoral programs in religious studies. Others provide a significant part of the faculty for the Christian studies part of religious studies in a separate graduate department of religion. In either case, faculty often serve dual or even triple functions. That is, they not only shape doctoral study but also contribute to the theological education of ministers and/or to the liberal arts education of undergraduates.

As a result, distinct from freestanding seminaries and theological schools, university-based theological schools have a public mediational and interpretative role thrust on them by their institutional environment. On the one hand, they have an important responsibility to interpret congregational and religious practices and beliefs to the university. On the other hand, they must interpret the scholarship of the university to those within religious communities and beyond. This public mediational and interpretative role requires a certain disciplinary and methodological self-consciousness about religion, faith, and the study of religion and faith that allows faculty to speak to both the religiously disenfranchised and to the religiously faithful and converted.

One important aspect of this interpretative, mediational role is simply making critical assessments and raising questions about a tradition and its beliefs that those in denominational seminaries are less free to undertake. All too often, faculty in seminaries subject to ecclesial controversy or denominational scrutiny must agree with one participant in these ATS conversations who observed that "there are certain matters that we simply no longer talk about in my seminary."[6] Part of the mission of theological schools in universities is to raise questions and concerns that more formally religious-affiliated schools cannot raise in their own more focused contexts.

At the same time, on the university front, another important aspect of the theological scholar's role is to make convincing arguments for the validity of what scholars of religion and theology do. Put quite simply, religion scholars have to convince others that religious beliefs can be studied with the same seriousness that the university devotes to other intellectual claims. In other words, they have to establish that theological scholarship is an important

enterprise distinct from the kind of reflection that occurs in faith communities and distinct from investigations of religion under the rubric of another discipline such as anthropology or literature. In a word, the dominant role of these schools in theological research and preparation of Ph.D. students forces them to be more explicit and differentiated in their understanding of the nature and purpose of theological scholarship to the academic public and the nature and purpose of the study of religion to the congregational or religious public.

Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue

A second distinctive role and responsibility for the university theological schools is already implied by the diversity within the schools and by the renewed possibility for genuine scholarship with equally genuine confessional presuppositions. University theological schools are uniquely situated to foster ecumenical and interreligious dialogue that reflects both the diversity of the university community and the theological school's deeper exploration of the specific traditions included in that community.

The university-related theological schools are in a position to explore the convergence and differences between religious communities on basic public issues—justice, equality, the relationship between community and individual responsibility, environmental concerns, etc. We know (partly on the basis of scholarship in religious studies) that religious traditions are very important in shaping values and attitudes on these issues. It seems likely, therefore, that public consensus on these important questions in a diverse society will depend in part on communication and mutual understanding between religious traditions and communities.

The framework for this ecumenical and interreligious communication is not a generalized "religious" understanding of the issues, still less a secularized notion of "values" that shape public policy, but a deeper understanding of the role that particular religious and theological traditions give to human welfare and human society through their specific understandings of the human relationship to the divine. In *The Death of Character,* James Davidson Hunter argues that efforts to base moral education and moral discussion on general "values," disconnected from particular religious traditions, has been a total failure.[7] An education that reconnects public policy and personal moral convictions does not involve constructing the kind of general religious unity often assumed by the term "ecumenism." It requires conversing ecumenically across and through differences. Such conversation requires a re-learning of one's own primary religious language, even as it requires greater awareness of the religious languages of others. University-related theological schools are, by the diversity of their faculties and student bodies, important contexts in which these efforts can take place and their curricula are attuned to the variety of religious languages that must be part of the conversation.

This re-learning is a neglected possibility, partly because university theological schools, like mainline Protestant schools generally, have gradually lost many of their working connections to real religious communities. University theological schools continue to be important centers for the exploration of traditions and theologies, but they are not always effective in communicating these explorations back to the primary communities where they are needed. They have become disconnected from some of the obvious channels for influencing the religious communities to which they relate.[8]

A Probing and Possibly Prophetic Role in Collaboration

The discussions that are possible for a university-related theological school are not confined to explorations of the nature of theological discourse (section 2) or ecumenical and interreligious dialogue between religious traditions (section 3). An appropriate, but often underdeveloped public voice for theological school faculty is to work with colleagues in other schools to raise and explore the fundamental, and often deeply religious, questions that arise in public discussions of biomedicine, democracy and human rights, business and globalization, and so forth. Many of the most important opportunities for these schools and some of the most interesting experiments on their campuses seek to establish connections with other disciplines and other forms of professional education within the university. The university itself is the first "public" for these discussions, since they often involve educating the rest of the university about the significance of religion and about the nature of theological education. Effective development of these opportunities with the university "public" promises, moreover, to provide ways to reach the wider public where theological education remains largely unknown.

There are many examples of this sort of collaboration in university-related theological schools. We might even see it as the distinctive activity of the university-related theological school at the end of the twentieth century. These collaborations have implications beyond their host schools, because they often also create opportunities for scholars from other non-university theological faculties to participate in research and develop an academic audience for their work. Three sorts of efforts have arisen: (1) interdisciplinary conferences on specific subjects that involve theological themes or relate to religious institutions and communities, (2) on-going institutional collaborations that link scholarship and professional practice across disciplines, and (3) research projects that provide an interdisciplinary focus on key institutions and issues, and include major attention to religion.

As an example in the first category, recently Yale University Divinity School joined with the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies in sponsorship of a major conference, "The Good in Nature and Humanity: Connecting Science, Religion, and the Natural World." Participants in the

conference—scientists, social scientists, and specialists in religion alike—shared the basic premise that religious perspectives and questions would enrich the understanding of important environmental issues. In a similar fashion, the University of Chicago Divinity School recently hosted a conference, "The Sacred and The Sovereign," in which a diverse and distinguished group of scholars in theology, ethics, the military, and political science examined the complex set of issues around human rights, religious commitment, national sovereignty, and humanitarian intervention. For more than ten years, Southern Methodist University's (SMU) Perkins School of Theology has cooperated with the SMU School of Law and the University of Texas's Southwestern Medical Center to present an annual "Conference of the Professions" that brings clergy, lawyers, and physicians together to study a topic of public importance.

While all these conferences are one-time efforts to put religious understandings of serious public issues on the table, longer-term programs of collaborative study have developed in a number of institutions. Both Emory University, with the contributions of faculty at Candler School of Theology and other university faculty, and Vanderbilt University Divinity and Law Schools, offer joint degree programs of law and religion. Emory describes the heart of its program as a dialectical relationship between religion and law "designed to explore the religious dimensions of law, the legal dimensions of religion, and the interaction of legal and religious ideas and methods." Both religion and law have distinct contributions in this conversation: "religion gives law its spirit and inspires its adherence to ritual, tradition, and justice. Law gives religion its structure and encourages its devotion to order, organization, and orthodoxy."[9]

More recently, Vanderbilt University initiated the Cal Turner Program in Moral Leadership for the Professions in 1996 as a university-wide program dedicated to the discussion and promotion of moral values relevant to the professional schools and the practice of the professions. The program links the schools of business, law, medicine, and religion and coordinates both university and wider community events and initiatives. In 2000, Duke University Divinity School founded The Duke Institute on Care at the End of Life as an interdisciplinary effort to promote research, guide public policy, and improve services for the dying on the part of a wide range of caregivers, from clergy to health care providers to lay volunteers. The Divinity School of the University of Chicago established The Martin Marty Center in 1998 with an even broader mandate to study the importance of public religion.[10] The Marty Center brings scholars pursuing advanced research in religion into active conversation with public groups drawn from faith communities, the professions, civil society, and other parts of higher education. It does so from the conviction that the best and most innovative scholarship in religion and theology emerges from sustained dialogue with the wider society.

Both conferences and programs obviously have significant research components. Our final example of collaboration, however, centers primarily on research. The Religion, Culture, and Family Project, directed by Don Browning at The Divinity School of The University of Chicago, is an example of such research collaboration. Funded in coordination with the Louisville Institute by a generous grant from Lilly Endowment Inc., it seeks to address the contemporary situation of American families from a range of historical, legal, biblical, and cultural perspectives. Guided by the claim that religious traditions have valuable theological, ethical, and institutional resources to help revitalize North American family culture and families, the project has produced a number of major books authored by more than 100 leading family and religion scholars, and has sponsored conferences, scholarly and popular articles, and media projects.[12]

Many of the conferences and programs through which university-related theological schools make more visible contributions to public discussions focus on policy questions. They become a persuasive reminder, first to the university "public" and then to the wider community, that theological studies offer important resources for answering the questions that legislators, policy makers, and social critics have posed. One of the most important areas for collaboration, however, lies in the framing of the questions themselves. In some cases, public issues cannot be fully understood without recourse to basic theological understandings of human relationships and the human condition. Where these are neglected, the policy solutions will necessarily be inadequate or superficial.

Perhaps the clearest example of this in recent history is the work of the "Truth and Reconciliation Commission" that helped to set the moral and legal terms for dealing with the legacy of apartheid in South Africa. A theological understanding of the conditions for forgiveness, reconciliation, and future unity provided in this case the framework for the policy discussion itself, and not just a theological answer to the policy makers' questions.[11] The large part that churches, religious leaders, and theologians played in these developments suggests an important part of the public character of religious life that deserves further exploration in North American theological education. Are there public issues around which our theological schools might contribute to a resolution by reframing the discussion in theological terms? If so, how would they create a forum in which those concepts might be learned and tested? The public available to a theological school within its own university may be one place where these questions can be opened for discussion.

The possibilities are by no means confined to "truth" and "reconciliation." Other key theological concepts that have equally important implications for public discussion include "forgiveness," "promise-keeping" or "fidelity," and "remembrance." As a result of the influence of movements in South Africa, the impact of the Holocaust and work of Elie Wiesel[13] and others, and other related

developments, there is broad cultural agreement now about the need to remember the evil committed and suffered, honoring those who suffered in the past and seeking to protect the innocent in the future. Side by side with recognition of the importance of memory is recognition of its ambiguity, its potential for perpetrating violence as much as allaying it, and its contradictory interpretations. Exploration of such theological themes requires both a deeper understanding of their place in theological traditions (as in section 2 above) and a more attentive listening across the disciplines to discussions about the future of human community, both local and international.

As a second step in the effort to explore the public character of university-related theological schools, our working group plans to sponsor two conferences at Duke University Divinity School and Emmanuel College of Victoria University around the themes of "memory and forgiveness." The conferences will be focused around two specific historical issues: slavery in the United States and the treatment of indigenous peoples in Canada.

The project at Emmanuel College will focus particularly on the legal, political, and philosophical debate surrounding Christian residential schools. This discussion involves complex questions of guilt, blame, responsibility, and justice, as well as repentance and reconciliation. The aim will be not only to study these important public moral questions, but also to observe what happens when those who speak the language of theology talk with those from other departments of the university who have both special scholarly expertise and particular commitments as members of faith communities.

Duke University Divinity School, on the other hand, will address the thorny intellectual, political, and practical challenges of racial reconciliation. This effort is designed to challenge the wider public to think and talk differently about important public issues and dilemmas, responding not only to directions for policy, but also to their most deeply held understandings of human nature and the possibilities for human community. In such collaborations, theological scholarship has the potentially prophetic role of dissolving fixed political commitments and recalling persons to a vision of community more in keeping with their basic commitments to justice.

A future issue of *Theological Education* will report on these conferences and suggest further implications for theological scholarship and the shape of the theological curriculum. We also anticipate using the results of the two campus-based conferences on "memory and forgiveness" to plan a larger and more visible public discussion, thus illustrating (we hope) the movement from the university "public" to the wider public where theology and theological education need to become more visible.

To return to a fundamental question that sparked the ATS project: How will a curriculum that takes into consideration the public character of theological education look differently? What in particular will faculty, students, and courses do? What about the "hidden curriculum" beyond the classroom?

Important curricular implications emerge in each of the three areas of responsibility discussed above. If convincing public theological scholarship is one of the distinct contributions of university-related divinity schools, then a primary focus of teaching includes seizing upon reading, writing, and speaking exercises not as mere course requirements but as part of the formation of public presence and voice. University divinity schools must build on their long traditions of educating people for public and community service through a variety of legal and social organizations by exploring the relevance of theological insights in these settings. Likewise, greater intentionality about interreligious understanding and communication is of utmost importance internal to the divinity school itself. Even though Baptists, Jews, Pentecostals, and Unitarian Universalists sit side by side in class, they may neither know the rich resources of their own traditions nor reach any kind of understanding of the traditions of the persons next to them. Exploration of one's own traditions and dialogue with others will not happen without explicit curricular design. Finally, university-based divinity schools have created a rich variety of self-standing centers and institutions in their midst perhaps without enough attention to the impact of these collaborative cross-disciplinary, cross-institutional programs on their students and the curriculum itself. These programs have great potential to help students bridge the gap between theory and practice, private and public, research and life that has often been the bane of university education.

Members of the university-related divinity school study group included: Richard J. Wood, chair, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut; Phyllis D. Airhart, Emmanuel College of Victoria University, Toronto, Ontario; Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, Vanderbilt University Divinity School, Nashville, Tennessee; Clarence G. Newsome, Howard University Divinity School, Washington, DC; and Miroslav Volf, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

ENDNOTES

1. For example, books on faith and scholarship include such works as Mark Schwehn, *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Douglas Sloan, *Faith and Knowledge: Mainline Protestantism and American Higher Education* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994); Conrad Cherry, *Hurrying toward Zion: Universities, Divinity Schools, and American Protestantism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); George M. Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); and James Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light: The Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from Their Christian Churches* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). Other books on the public voice of religion include such works as Paul J. Weitham, ed., *Religion and Contemporary Liberalism* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1997); Robert Audi and Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Religion in the Public Square: The Place of Religious Convictions in Political Debate* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997); Ronald F. Thiemann, *Religion in Public Life: A Dilemma for Democracy* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1996).

2. See, for example Carol Orsborn, *Return From Exile: One Woman's Journey Back to Judaism* (New York: Continuum, 1998).

3. For a review of recent books representative of the trend toward a more balanced and appreciative account of religion's role in liberal democracy, see Brian Stiltner, "Reassessing Religion's Place in a Liberal Democracy," *Religious Studies Review* 26, no. 4 (October 2000): 319-25.

4. See Wilfrid Sellars, Richard Rorty, and Robert Brandom, eds., *Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997); Richard Rorty, *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Evelyn Fox Keller, *Reflections on Gender and Science*, 10th ed., (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996); and Sandra Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

5. See Richard J. Bernstein, *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983).

6. Informal conversation in the course of the ATS project.

7. James Davison Hunter, *The Death of Character: Moral Education in an Age Without Good or Evil* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

8. See "Theme Introduction" to this issue, page xiv.

9. See Website: http://serv1.law.emory.edu/religion/about/about_start.htm

10. See Carrie B. Dohe and Jonathan Ebel, eds., "Public Religion Project: Assessing Public Religion in the United States," Occasional Papers, Vol. 1, The Martin Marty Center (2000).

11. Desmond Tutu, *No Future Without Forgiveness* (New York: Doubleday, 1999); James Cochrane, John deGruchy, and Stephen Martin, eds., *Facing the Truth: South African Community and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1999).

12. For information on publications and projects of the Religion, Culture, and Family Project, see Website: http://www.uchicago.edu/divinity/family

13. See Elie Wiesel, *From the Kingdom of Memory: Reminiscences* (New York: Summit Books, 1990).