

"

BOISI CENTER

!"

"

sesquicentennial planning efforts. To Joe Quinn, interim provost and chair of the sesquicentennial academic events committee, and to David Quigley, current A&S dean, all of whom, among others, have invested extensive time and money and effort – they might well say blood, sweat, and tears – to make sure that this conference goes as well as we expect it will.

Second, I'd like to thank the staff members who have made this possible today, some of whom have worked on this with us for two years now. Courtney Hough of the advancement office is back in the back. There she is. Conor Kelly, a theology Ph.D. student, back in the back, as well. Frank Murtaugh of the vice president's office, staff from the Boisi Center and elsewhere – they've been terrific to work with, and I thank you all for so much of your time over the past two years and all day today.

I'll note that we're recording today's events on audio and video. We'll have transcripts that we post of every panel as soon as we possibly can, and you'll be able to find all of these along with much more at [bc.edu/150](http://bc.edu/150) and at [bc.edu/boisi](http://bc.edu/boisi), B-O-I-S-I. We are tweeting today at #bc150, and I invite you all to do the same. And finally, I ask you that you silence your cell phones during the course of the academic events this morning so that we're not disrupting one another in the process.

Before I turn the floor over to our panelists, I'd like to say just a few words of introduction about the themes of the conference. Let me state the basic premise clearly – there is a fundamental tension between unity and diversity that cannot be resolved. Our bodies, our experiences, our perceptions, our ideas and beliefs – they are unique to each of us as individuals, even as we join others in body, mind, and spirit to live in this world together. When we come together in families or communities or nations and describe an us, we need a them, as well. There's always an other. And so one of our basic tasks today is to figure out – one of our basic tasks in our lives is to figure out what makes us us and them. What defines our shared experience and what defines our separate experience?

Religions have provided answers to that question for thousands of years, and we all know the stories of conflict and perhaps less so the stories of cooperation that religious diversity has given us. But of course, politics, too, provides an answer or answers to the question of identity and difference. In the era of nation-states, the

sovereign state makes its claim to unify its diverse citizens under the banner of shared heritage or shared values. And in some sense, the work of managing diversity can be seen as a central feature of the history of the United States.

For its first 175 years as a sovereign state, the United States took as its national motto, *e pluribus unum*, out of many, one. Of course, that changed in 1956 amidst the Cold War struggle against atheist communism when *In God we trust* was adopted by Congress as a national motto, an entirely different way of establishing or claiming unity. But we know that the sort of diversity experienced and conceptualized by our founding generation pales in comparison to the religious, ethnic, and racial diversity we see in the contemporary United States. One of our tasks today at this conference is to take a look at this journey over the past 150 years, the years of Boston College's experience, and assess how we've done, what we've learned, and where we might be headed in terms of our religious diversity.

Another task is to take up the challenge of the common good. Is there such a thing, and in what might it consist when we disagree on so many things about what is true and what is good and what it takes for individuals and communities to flourish? In doing so, our distinguished speakers today will reflect both on lived experience and on theoretical principles. It may well be that working for the common good requires that we focus on our lived experiences, our ways of getting along amidst great diversity. But as they say at the University of Chicago where I was trained, that's all well and good in practice, but how does it work in theory?

Fortunately, we don't need to choose theory or practice today. We will get both from some of the best scholars of our generation. Indeed, today's conference is a chance for all of us at Boston College to think about what we do here collectively and why we do it. And I want to invite every one of you in the audience to join

Quigley:

Good morning. Thank you so much, Erik. I'll ask my four conversation partners to join me here on the podium in just a moment, but let me offer the introductions before we start with the discussion of this most important topic. First, let me thank Erik and his co-organizer, Alan Wolfe. The two of them have really done so much to pull together this rich set of conversations today, and to imagine in some ways the book ends for this entire sesquicentennial celebration, starting a year ago with Erik's leadership – a full day thinking about the religious aims of liberal education in a higher education context, and then today thinking about the common good, the ways in which religion shapes our politics, our public life, our connections across difference.

I'd also like to thank, as Erik did, the 150<sup>th</sup> planning team, and in particular, Terry Devino, Frank Murtaugh, and Courtney Hough, who've done such remarkable work across so many symposia, large events, a mass in Fenway Park. The logistics have boggled the mind. I think they're all very happy that we're getting to the end of our three semesters of celebrating our 150<sup>th</sup>.

We've got a wonderful program here today, and I'm very happy that the five of us will be able to kick it off by turning to the past, thinking about what the last 150 years have to say about the themes and topics today, and I hope very much to shape this afternoon's discussion. Let me introduce this morning's four very distinguished panelists.

Marie Griffith, the John C. Danforth Professor in the Humanities at Washington University in St. Louis, is currently the director of the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics. Prior to moving to St. Louis a couple years ago, she taught at Princeton University, where she was associate director of the Center for the Study of Religion, and also the director of the program in the Study of Women and Gender. She later served as the John A. Bartlett professor at Harvard Divinity School while serving on the faculty committee in Harvard's History of American Civilization program. Among her numerous important publications are *God's Daughters: Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission* and *Born Again Bodies: Flesh and Spirit in American Christianity*. Her latest will soon appear from W.W. Norton, the compellingly titled *Christians*,

Our second speaker today will be Omar McRoberts, associate professor in the sociology department at the University of Chicago, a scholar of the sociology of religion whose interests include urban poverty, race, and collective action. His *Streets of Glory: Church and Community in a Black Urban Neighborhood* is rooted in his ethnographic work here in Four Corners, a Boston enclave, a study that highlights the complex interplay of faith and community in one particular urban location at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Omar is currently writing on black religious responses to and influences on social welfare policy since the New Deal, culminating with George W. Bush's office of faith-based and community initiatives.

Our third speaker from very close to home is Jim O'Toole, the holder of the Clough Millennium Chair in History here at Boston College. Jim previously served as archivist for the archdiocese of Boston and on the faculty at the University of Massachusetts. Among his work are *Militant and Triumphant: William Henry O'Connell and the Catholic Church in Boston*, and most recently, *The Faithful: A History of Catholics in America*.

Before calling our four distinguished presenters up to the podium, let me just take a couple of minutes to add a little bit to Erik's excellent framing of what we're trying to do, both all day, but especially this morning. How we'll proceed is, again, I'll offer up a few questions, many of them framed by Erik as he put together the conference, to spark at least the beginning of a conversation among the five of us. After a little bit more than an hour of back and forth, I'll turn to you, our audience, to help sustain the conversation. We'll have mics that'll move around the hall, and I hope that we can continue this conversation until at least noon, at which point all of you are invited to join us for lunch. The doors on the two sides of this hall will open and we'll have a buffet lunch that you're certainly welcome to enjoy.

Again, before calling the four scholars up here, let me just emphasize what our charge is for the five of us this morning – to bring a historical perspective to bear on this question of the relationship between religious diversity and Americans' historically evolving understandings of the common good. How do we think about 1863 to 2013 as both an illuminating framework and as a starting point for the later discussions in this afternoon's panel and the keynote at the end of the day?

In particular, I'd like to emphasize and call on my fellow panelists to think about questions of American distinctiveness. How can we think about the particular ways in which faith is lived and experienced in America in the 19<sup>th</sup> and the 20<sup>th</sup> and in the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries? And as I thought about this process, partly because I'm so deep in our own institutional sesquicentennial, I thought of different moments – 1863 – 1913, when Boston College moves out from the enclave of the South End here to Chestnut Hill – 1963, where in our centennial year, John F. Kennedy came and delivered his remarks as part of our 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration – and then here in 2013.

What has it meant to talk about religious diversity? At the same time, what has it meant to talk about religious particularity and the relationship to the common good? In this very institution, Boston College has long aspired to contribute to the common good, but at the same time was founded out of a sense of and has been sustained out of a sense of religious particularity and particular sometimes parochial interests and concerns. How do we here at Boston College – but then I hope in our conversations, more broadly – balance, hold in tension the different aspects of religious

diversity but also particularity? The common good, but also particular interests.

With that as just a little bit way of framing, let me ask my four fellow panelists to join me up here. Choreography is a little bit of a challenge. Let's make sure we all have our mics on and that you can hear us as we go along.

Let me offer up, again – going beyond my comments and especially Erik's – the first of the questions that were put to us as we thought about this over the last month or beyond, as those of you who were invited awhile ago – this relationship between religious diversity, a central fact of the American experience across not just these 150 years, but going back to colonial times, and shifting conceptions and understandings – at times conflicting conceptions of the common good.

The first of these questions that Erik I think helpfully offers up is the question, what changes in our religious demographics as a nation – we can begin at regional levels if you want or in particular denominations and faith traditions, but the more national story I think is what we want to tease out – what changes in those demographics have we seen over these last 150 years? How have some of these shifting demographics mapped on to ethnic and racial demographics? And in some ways, before we get to the question of the common good as the organizing theme across the day, what would you emphasize in terms of the most important demographic shifts that have characterized this historical evolution? Jim, since you're the local, do you want to start off?

O'Toole:

I teach an undergraduate History of Religion in America course. Five or 600 years in one semester makes for kind of a breakneck pace always. But what I say to students at the beginning is that most of the story we'll be talking about when we think of religious diversity today – most of the time we'll be spending talking about a very narrow window of that. And for most of that five or 600 years, the story of religion in America will be not exclusively but predominantly variations on Christianity and Judaism.

That can be difficult with students at the outset, because given the nature of religious diversity today, their interests are broader than just that. So spending time trying to explain the difference

between Presbyterians and Congregationalists can – students can say, what are you talking about? Where are the more interesting subjects? But it seems to me that just demographically, other religious traditions – Asian traditions, Islam certainly – don't enter the story – if you look at it historically, don't enter the story until relatively late in the story. And so it's always a challenge to try to address that balance.

Quigley: Jonathan?

Sarna: Jumping right off from Jim's comment, I teach a class in the history of American Judaism. And I think that the essential theme is really how the coming of Jews to America broadened the sense of the commons. And it's interesting to remember that that happens very quickly. To give you a sense, there were probably 3,000 Jews in America in 1820, 15,000 in 1840, 15,000 in 1860, a quarter of a million in 1880, 6.7 million today. You begin to think about that growth and how it changes and transforms America.

When Boston College was founded, as you pointed out, David, in 1863, so that coincides with what is really the single greatest official act of anti-Semitism in American history, General Grant banning what he calls Jews as a class from his war zone in very late 1862. And very early in 1863, Abraham Lincoln overturns that order. And I think Lincoln actually is coming to grips with a changing America. I don't think it's accident that in his inaugural – there's still Christological references in the first inaugural – but by the Gettysburg Address, it's one nation, under God. That's a rather interesting reframing of America. It takes quite a while before that's accepted.

But I am very impressed at how the presence of Jews in America has transformed the way we think about America, just as the coming of Muslims and Asian religions has forced us to do that in more recent times.

Griffith: It's the coming of Catholics, too, right? In preparing for this conversation, I was thinking back to one of my former mentors from graduate school, the late William Hutchison, always pointed out that even the colonists in America always took pride – they're very proud of their tolerance for diversity. At least that's when they stopped executing Quakers. And they're always proud, touted



this as a great value, until it became difficult. And it became difficult in the New Republic with Irish immigration, with German immigration.

So it's Catholics as well as Jews that just transform Protestants' ways of imagining themselves, and I mean white Protestants. It's also slaves and African-Americans who become Christianized and take on Christianity as their own religion with the message of emancipation and liberation for them, theologically speaking and politically speaking, that also transformed this whole white Protestant mindset that was so taken for granted in so many ways prior to that time.

And since that time, I guess it seems to me our history is one of concurrent and competing trajectories. This growing diversity on the one hand has truly led over time I think to increasing tolerance and a celebration of diversity and all the things that are still here with us now. And at the same time, it led to growing intolerance, hatred, and even violence against Catholics, against Jews, against Mormons, African-American Christians, Chinese, Japanese, Muslims, and on and on.

Quigley: We were very pluralistic in our hatred.

Griffith: In our violence, yes. So I think, to me, the conversation, in a way, and the day, I take it, as you're asking us to reflect on those competing and concurrent trajectories, right, that it's sort of happening at the same time and where we end up now.

McRoberts: Yeah, I think about the arrival of Africans here under the pretence often of not even being human, let alone whether or not they're a part of the common or not. It really wasn't a question of whether these enslaved human beings were part of a common of course until after abolition, which does a couple of things from a religious standpoint. And I think about the span we're talking about here

churches and denominations, which constituted, arguably, a common

different moments, Catholic commons, other denominational commons as we move forward, and how that might shift and link up to a broader understanding of a universal commons or what you might mean by a public good.

First, though, as a historian, let me step back a little bit, because

to a movement where America steps back. And the hopefulness, that sense that, yes, we can build a common, we can bring everybody in and educate them, is transformed, I think, into great suspicion as to whether that can happen. If one is looking at one of





fact, that market, which is new, of course, in the study of American religion, but I think a very powerful idea that also links American religion to some of our studies of American capitalism – that market, that diversity is, if we can paraphrase Churchill on capitalism, the worst system in the world except for all the others. It's what distinguishes us from places that had wars of religion.

It is that sense which emerges in the 20<sup>th</sup> century both in ethnicity and in religion approximately at the same time. People like Horace Kallen and others were writing about pluralism, that sense that the great strength of America is its religious diversity, that in fact, in competing, these various faiths also learn from one another. They borrow good ideas from one another. They are all strengthened ultimately, as is religion generally, by that pluralism.

And indeed, today, when people ask why is America so different from Europe, why have we not seen the dramatic secularization that has run across especially Western Europe, the standard answer is that free market in religion, that sense there is no state religion, there is great religious diversity – if you don't like one church, there are unlimited numbers of alternatives. It's not a dissenting church in a European sense. That that's really what made religion in America so very strong. So we moved from seeing religious diversity as a problem to actually celebrating that diversity and seeing it as a very great strength.

Griffith: Unless you're Sam Harris or Christopher Hitchens or Richard Dawkins, right? And they may have something to tell us also about thinking about this. I've been curious about this whole day and the framing of this around religious diversity – are we sure that that's always and everywhere a good thing? Are we saying, well, religion is good? It leads to the common good always and everywhere. There are a few exceptions, but on the whole, that is a good thing. So I'd be curious to think about that, as well.

O'Toole: I'd just say, connecting to the previous turning points question, it seems to me that on these kinds of issues, the period after the Second World War really is critical in a number of respects. I shouldn't attempt to practice sociology in public, especially in the presence of my colleagues, but it seems to me, suburbanization really matters for churches, certainly on the Catholic side of things. The spreading of Catholicism from the inner cities to the suburbs, it seems to me, just has all kinds of difference – makes a huge

" !'

difference. I say to students all the time, the church is a very different thing when it's something you pass five times a day as you're going to school or the market or just wherever.

There's a wonderful letter in the Boston archdiocesan archives written by Honey Fitz, Mayor Fitzgerald, to Cardinal O'Connell, the archbishop at the time. And the theme of the letter is basically what a wonderful person Rose turned out to be, the mother of President Kennedy. And Honey Fitz says in the letter, she never goes anywhere but she doesn't find a church to stop in for a few minutes and make a visit. And if you visit the Kennedy family home in Brookline just a couple of miles away, there's the home, and just down the street is the church where they all went.

Again, it seems to me the mental world for church members, for religious people – when the



"

! (

begin to talk that way much earlier in the century. E. Franklin Frazier, the great sociologist, said there are too many churches.

"

!)

At

for the gatherings, the practices, the traditions of other communities must have some relation to what we think of as participation in our

good and a desire to extend civil rights to all Americans. I'm not sure it would happen today. An amazing moment in American history, but it is worth remembering that what that meant was that a value that was deeply rooted in American individualism was

what ultimately is defined as the good is that justice be done in such a way that brings about equality among all of these peoples within this nation that's on this divinely ordained but not inevitable historical trajectory.

O'Toole:

For Catholics, it seems to me, the change that occurs in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century at just the same time as the civil rights movement – the change in the official understanding of Catholics in relation to other religious groups that comes with the Second Vatican Council, that moving away from a John Hughes kind of, well, at some point, Americans will just come to their senses and everyone will be a Catholic and that will solve the problem. The shift from that attitude expressed here in Boston in the 1940s and '50s by the largely justly forgotten Father Leonard Feeney – all non-Catholics are going to hell by definition – when he was finally excommunicated from the church, I think a lot of local Catholics thought, wait, isn't that what we believe? What's the problem here?

But the shift from that in a very short period of time to the documents on inter-religious dialogue as a dialogue more or less among equals – the shift in that official position, it seems to me, both has an effect on Catholics and may also have underlined senses that they had as they came to know more people who were outside their own religious tradition. So I don't want to hang too much on the official teaching kind of thing. It's not as though Catholics in the pews everywhere were reading the documents of Vatican II and understanding what many of them were. I don't want to make this too much of a top-down thing. But it seems to me that that just changed the terms of discussion for Catholics, and therefore perhaps opened them more to considerations of a broader public good.

Sarna:

Certainly Vatican II is crucial, and actually I think Cardinal Cushing even anticipated some aspects of Vatican II. But I would not underestimate something like Will Herberg's book *Protestant Catholic Jew*. The very fact that it is such a bestseller for so long and that it gives a term – there it is, Protestant Catholic Jew – to America – for all of the faults of that book, and for all of what he did not see, it is very remarkable, so much so that on my campus, they built three chapels that are allegedly the same size – and actually one is larger – and don't cast shadows on one another – that is an architectural message that we accept Herberg, and we translate that into religious architectural terms. And you actually, of course,



You really almost got competing traditions calling themselves Protestant or evangelical or whatnot, not even thinking about Catholics. So I think that's a valid point. I'd love to hear what other people think about that, as well.

McRoberts:

Well, it certainly means that within the religious field can be found much political diversity. And one of the consequences of what we call separation of church and state is that religious institutions can then enter the political field as very important and vocal players, and there are plenty who have entered on the side of retrenchment of all sorts of social welfare. There are those who have entered the political field as advocates of more generous provision. But it means that we can't look at the religious field just as a field of private

actually to look earlier than that where, indeed, it was up to faith communities to take care of their own. So the Catholic community developed a rich system for Catholics, and the Jewish community for Jews, and Protestants, as well. And there was an assumption



Both political parties actively voting for them. It seems to me the way Catholics have broken in presidential elections has had a large effect on the outcome of those elections.

That's obviously the point at which religious particularity meets the public electoral system, and I'm not sure exactly where that's going. But I think it has this effect, then, on how much should the



the basis of religion to be free. And there, again, he, I think, moved lots of people to feel that demonstrating in Washington – it's the single largest demonstration of American Jews in all history in Washington in 1986 – that that was a religious activity no less than a political activity.

In World War II, when a few Orthodox rabbis demonstrated that the Jewish community is very embarrassed and somewhat horrified that they would do such a thing. Today view differently. By the 1980s, that notion of demonstrating to free Jews in the Soviet Union, to urge the president to move in that direction and so on, that becomes normative and the merger of religion and political action.

Griffith:

I would just say that in the liberal Protestant tradition – and I would include evangelicals outside of the new Christian right there – you have many leaders. Just as you not only had Martin Luther King, you have many visionaries besides King. And I'll quote Hollinger again, whose book, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire*, I just strongly recommend, his latest collection of essays, and this is very relevant here. He's consumed with questions, I think, about religion and the public good in that book.

But his point there is that Ecumenical Protestant and Protestant, Catholic, and Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and on and on, cooperation – these were group efforts. There were visionary men and women in these organizations, like the National Council of Churches and others. But these were collective efforts, too. So I guess I would resist slightly the who was the visionary thinker on this and say there was so much activity on the ground, in the churches, in the theological schools, in the pastoral counseling world, in all of these kinds of settings, that were really generating these larger movements against racism, for women's rights, against various wars and genocide, and so many of the progressive reforms of the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

And just to linger on this for a moment, Hollinger's point is that they – even though it looks like the decline of mainline Protestantism today, he wants to reframe that whole argument into saying, actually, liberal Protestants won the day in terms of their reforms. And if their children and their grandchildren have become more secular, as many of us have, that's not to say that the reforms themselves weren't tremendously successful or that that

"

#)

political vision didn't in some ways succeed. And that's a vision also of the common good being about rights and participation and equal access for so many things. So the struggle continues, but I think all of that is a very important piece of this discussion, as well.

McRoberts:

Graham. But my concern here is these political leaders, who do they have next to them and what are they learning about the common good from religious characters that they situate very close to themselves?

O'Toole:

The Catholic figure I'd point to, I think, is probably largely forgotten today. But the Catholic figure I'd point to in this context is John A. Ryan, who was a professor at the Catholic University in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and associated with what was called at the time the National Catholic Welfare Conference to try to oversee coordinated efforts around the country. And Ryan was significant, I think, not so much for his own political effectiveness. His program included unionization and demands for the living wage and so on.

It's not so much his own successes, but the degree to which he spread out into Catholic parishes, Catholic universities, Catholic schools, the emerging papal social teaching encyclicals. It was as a spreader of those messages that I think he really had his impact, not so visibly himself, but it seems to me in terms of the broad impact. This is the man whom Father Coughlin dismissed cynically as he's just Right Reverend New Dealer – an expression, perhaps, from Coughlin that there really was some power there in the spreading out of those ideas.

Quigley:

Getting back to my earlier point about how do we imagine or formulate, understand the post-war, how far does it go, I think Billy Graham really is critical. As I was thinking about this panel, I came back to him a few times, and as much Graham, even more so his audiences, the shifting audiences over the course of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. One of my favorite studies of 19<sup>th</sup> century intellectual history is by Mary Cayton, an essay in

meaning in his pronouncements. Again, it's not – I completely agree – not just the great man, but that relationship between visionary or leader and audiences and movements that's so interesting over the last 150 years.

history. And it seems to me there is a very powerful message from the stories that we have told and that we have written, which is precisely it's not that you sit back and watch it unfold on your computer screen or on CNN. It's those people who made and shaped history whom we are recounting. And I think we still are seeking and looking for those people who hopefully will be inspired by the past to produce more change going forward.

Griffith:

I completely agree, and I'm reminding of the last line in your book about when General Grant expelled the Jews – in America, hatred

are and how different they are, where they actually overlap, where the ugly parts really are. There is a tendency with every kind of narrative to focus on the moment of redemption or the moment of grace or the moment of emancipation, which has a way of beatifying the ugly parts that came before. And it's perhaps only through that kind of amnesia that people can move forward in a sane fashion and just kind of get down the street. But as scholars, we have to look at all of it and not be amnesiac.

I guess from a political perspective, the challenge is always – and this is part of what I study – the challenge is always to make these stories feed in to one seemingly seamless whole. Yes, out of many, one. And what's interesting from my own scholarly perspective is how the fishers remain, and how people will push back and want to assert their particular story, and want to join the mainstream, as it were, when it's politically expedient to do so. And that's, I think, part of our task to study these things, as well. How the attempt to make one out of many are so fraught with difficulty and challenge.

Quigley: At this point, I invite you in the audience to raise your hand if you have any questions. We have a couple of folks on the edge in the hall who will come around. All I'd ask is wait for them to come by with the microphone so we can hear your questions. We have nearly a half hour for the Q&A. So we have one in the middle of the hall here.

Cuenim: Thank you. I'm Walter Cuenin, the Catholic chaplain at Brandeis.



speech, and for people who have no faith. That would have been impossible to say from a President of the United States.

So I think the big question now is what will be the future of religion in our country. Many of you have been to Europe, and you've seen what happened. Catholic France is hardly Catholic, which is OK. I'm not criticizing. But what will be the trajectory

"

%"

That happens in cities. It happens in churches and synagogues. The new person is the antithesis of the other, and often doesn't last so long, and then you try and find someone in the middle. Nobody quite – at least I don't know what the real content of the new mayor of New York will be. It's all we can do to keep up with Boston politics.

O'Toole: Let me jump in here as someone who specializes in the politics of my home city, New York. One thing that's striking about de Blasio, the Cambridge native who becomes mayor of New York, is that the kind of shrines that he visited across the campaign, and then even when Obama came to visit, it's Junior's for cheesecake. There's a kind of secular landscape of the transcendent that he's appealing to, if I can use such language.

The other thing is that Cardinal Dolan, who has been quite assertive in a whole host of different settings, has not directed – and his predecessor, Cardinal Egan – did not direct much of their fire at Bloomberg and before them, Giuliani. It's been 20 years since we've had a Democratic mayor of New York. And if you remember back to the late Koch years and early Dinkins years with Cardinal O'Connor, there was a fairly strident opposition that kicked in, especially on the part of the cardinal, on sexual politics terms and others that we've – again, as a native New Yorker, I've been thankful that we haven't had that relationship between St. Pat's and Gracie Mansion for 20 years.

A concern that I would have going forward with de Blasio, who I think is going to champion progressive politics across various different fields – how does that play out with Dolan? Again, we're watching to see how the cardinal recalibrates his public self in the aftermath of Cardinal Francis's elevation back in the spring. But I would voice at least, as a native Brooklynite, some concerns about a return to some of that kind of inter-borough nastiness that sometimes characterizes church political relations, at least in Catholic New York.

Quigley: Other questions? We had another one here in the front row, I know, and then in the back, and then over here.

Patton: Hi, I'm Laurie Patton. I'm from Duke University, but I grew up here in Boston. I heard a number of different small comments that

"

\$'





might not be familiar with that. And I'll get to my question in a second, but just by explanation – in the early '80s, a huge movement came about and many seminaries started for those nones or spiritual but not religious. And what basically, by people like Matthew Fox, who you might know, interspiritual – I am ordained as a Protestant pastor, but then co-ordained as an interfaith pastor after many, many more years of training in comparative religion and spiritual practices.

And what seems to be happening is we are the fastest growing tradition among the college campuses and the 20 and 30-somethings. And our worship and practices mix. So we have spiritual beliefs, traditions, practices, prayers in our worship in our get-togethers that are all mixed of different religions. And my question to the panel is how is academia, if at all, addressing this? A lot of what we do is in houses, is online, very digital based. Is it considered a bad thing, a mixing, a diluting of religious traditions, or as we would argue, we're peacemakers and bridge builders and serving those who don't fit inside a particular box?

Griffith:

I would say you've got a bunch of historians up here who don't necessarily make the evaluative claims that you're asking for, is it good or bad, but there are some wonderful scholars out there writing on spirituality, both historically but also doing ethnographic work in the present. People like Courtney Bender, who did all of her ethnographic work for *The New Metaphysicals* right here in Boston. So her book is *The New Metaphysicals*. And there's a range of folks like her, I think, more on the anthropology or sociology of religion than the history of religion, who are really looking at some of that.

So I think it's taken very seriously. I had never heard that it was the largest growing group on college campuses, so I'd be interested to see that data or how that study is going. But certainly, the Robert Putnam studies show that all kinds of new and creative things like that are happening out there, and that it's very difficult to predict where that will go. All of us have anecdotal evidence from our own classrooms of what students are interested in, and college students are notoriously – they always have been – interested in new and exotic looking things, and they sometimes do go to other services and mix things together. How sustaining that is over time will be the question, and that'll be what the historians grapple with later on.

Sarna:

Yeah, just to put it in a historical context, we talked about Triumphalism as one way of solving this problem. A second way, which I think is the tradition that you're coming out of, is a synchrotistic tradition. Aren't there ways of bringing this all together? In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, a man named Felix Adler develops ethical culture. His argument is I am going to draw from the great ethical traditions of all religions. Mine will really be the religion that unites people of religion and secular folks around the



Griffith: So-and-so became a Universal Life minister.

O'Toole: Absolutely.

Sarna: I would not – having had a son and daughter-in-law whose picture even appeared in those pages – nevertheless, I have to tell you, knowing now something about it, I'm not sure that those pages are a cross-section of America, even though I learn a lot about them.

(laughter)

Quigley: I think we have time for one more question over in this corner.

Hosein: My name is Shareda Hosein, former Muslim chaplain at Tufts University, and I am an ambassador to the Parliament of World's Religion building an ambassadorial program across the country, and I'm so appreciative that the point was made, because the Ahmadiyyas came to that conference. And where I'm going with this is the prophetic voices you were talking about – the Ahmadiyyas influenced Elijah Muhammad, and he claimed prophethood, and he was in some ways a prophetic voice for the marginalized African-Americans who couldn't fit into the

is the African-Americans that started out in the Nation of Islam. So I just wanted to share that as prophetic voices.

But my question is the billion dollar question. So right now, if you had the crystal ball, Islam – we're like the newest immigrants, and we have to go through this passage of rites. So if you're looking in a crystal ball, how long do you think this is going to last and that we'll be accepted and we'll become mainstream?

Quigley:

I'll start with a response. As I was trying to think about the questions Erik set up and the specializations and expertise up here, I came back to the question of what are some of the surprises. On the contemporary landscape, how has religious diversity played out in interesting ways? And not quite the wedding page, but one of the more interesting front page stories in the *Times* in the last couple years is the ways in which Muslim students have found Catholic universities particularly hospitable. I think it's one of the unexpected ways in which the ways in which we live our faiths in our institutional lives has played out in ways that not only in 1863, Father Gasson couldn't have predicted – I think 25 years ago, people wouldn't have seen it coming.

So just from my own particular vantage point as a historian and dean here at Boston College, and talking to leaders of other Catholic universities across the country, it's one of the surprises of this moment, where as you say, one of the great challenges in terms o

"

%"\$

"

%%

conversation will continue across the day. First, please join me in thanking all four of them for this remarkable panel.

(applause)

Quigley: Just to remind you, at 1:00, the second panel will commence here in this space.

END OF TAPE