This spring, the Institute welcomes six distinguished speakers to the University of Virginia to explore the forces of commodification and their extensive effects on contemporary culture.

With the political revolutions in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe more than ten years past, the free market is now the unchallenged form of political economy across the globe. Free markets have not only replaced command economies in the former communist states, but even the advanced capitalist nations have embraced still greater economic freedom, privatization, and less governmental interference to solve social problems and promote growth and efficiency.

What is most remarkable about this transformation, however, is not merely the way that the market has prevailed as the dominant form of economic organization, but rather the way that the logic of the market has spilled over into spheres of life traditionally understood to be non-economic. We now live not only in a market economy, but in a market society. Commodification—the process of turning something into or treating it as a mere object for sale—has been so broadly appropriated that virtually everything can become a commodity and almost no aspect of life is unaffected by market logic and discourse.

The speakers will debate a range of pressing questions concerning commodification’s causes and effects. What forces and cultural changes drive this tendency to commodify? Is anything resistant to it?

What happens to democracy and political order, marriage and the family, religion and morality, when they are conceptualized under market categories?

February 13
Juliet Schor presents “From Cool to Commodified: Targeting the American Child.” Schor, a professor of sociology at Boston College, is the author of The Overspent American and The Overworked American, and has written extensively on “the new consumerism” and the family.

February 27
George Ritzer, professor of sociology at the University of Maryland, discusses “The Globalization of Nothing.” In The McDonaldization of Society and other works, Ritzer has offered one of the most significant recent examinations of commercialization and its consequences.

Continued on page 2
“Commodification” continued

March 13

David Lyon from the sociology department of Queen’s University, Ontario presents, “Commodification, Classification, and the Culture of Control.” Professor Lyon’s books include Postmodernity, Jesus in Disneyland, and The Surveillance Society.

March 21

Graham Ward, Professor of Contextual Theology and Ethics and the director of the Centre for Religion, Culture and Gender at the University of Manchester, discusses “The Commodification of Religion.” A key figure in the Radical Orthodoxy movement, Ward’s work focuses on the importance of the postmodern cultural context to theological rhetoric and representation.

April 10

Kiku Adatto, a lecturer in Social Studies at Harvard University, focuses on the changing culture of childhood and community life in “Selling Out Childhood.” Adatto, the author of Picture Perfect: The Art and Artifice of Public Image Making, has written extensively on American culture and social history.

Michael Sandel, a professor of government at Harvard University, discusses, “Are There Some Things that Money Can’t Buy?: The Moral Limits of Markets.” Sandel has been a major figure in recent debates about contemporary liberalism and is the author of Liberalism and the Limits of Justice and Democracy’s Discontents.

All events are free and open to the public. A calendar appears on the back page of INSight, or check the Institute website at www.virginia.edu/iasc for more details.

Center Holds First Fellows Workshop

The Center on Religion and Democracy held its first Fellows Workshop on September 26-27, 2002. Each year the Center supports postdoctoral and doctoral Fellows, who participate in weekly colloquia, workshops, and Center events. The Fellows’ workshops foster interdisciplinary intellectual community by allowing Fellows to present works in progress and receive feedback from other Fellows and a variety of UVA faculty.

Four of the Center’s five postdoctoral Fellows presented at the Fall Workshop. Dr. James Bennett from Santa Clara University presented a paper on the role of the New Orleans Catholic Church in the construction of Creole identity. Catholicism was crucial to the recognition of Creoles as a distinct social and racial class; however, by the late nineteenth century, the Church in New Orleans was becoming more “Americanized,” recognizing only two racial categories: black and white. In this shift from a tri-racial to a bi-racial society, the church not only accommodated, but actually advanced the culture of Southern segregation.

Dr. David Yamane argued that the proper relationship between religion and politics is one of inherent and enduring tension. Dr. Yamane examined the strategies employed by religious groups in the Wisconsin state legislative arena to manage the tension between the prophetic demands of faith and the political realities of secular institutions. He found that the Wisconsin Catholic Conference does a better job managing this tension than mainline denominational groups (who opt for a one-sided “prophetic” resolution of the tension).
Architecture Symposium Explores Sacred Space

The Center on Religion and Democracy co-sponsored “(Un)Common Ground: Rethinking American Sacred Space,” a symposium of the University of Virginia Architecture Department. Held on October 31 through November 2, 2002, the symposium brought together scholars from a variety of disciplines to explore the intersection of religion and architecture in America. Historian Martin Marty, from the University of Chicago Divinity School, addressed a packed auditorium for the weekend’s keynote address, in which he urged his listeners to infuse theology into their study of religion and American material culture.

He began by reminding his audience that there is common to the human condition a drive to materialize or make permanent sacred experience. At the same time, he also noted that humans share the propensity to domesticate the sacred. We do this when we accept as beautiful that with which we are comfortable, the everyday or common ideals of beauty. Such pictures of beauty often whitewash the pains associated with religious devotion, by focusing attention only on God’s immanence in the familiar. Marty called this tendency, “beautiful beauty.” He warned his audience, though, against the opposite inclination of “terrible terror,” in which architecture reflects God in all God’s awesome power. Such buildings can be cold and make God seem distant.

Marty suggested “awe” as a theological concept that could bridge the gap between terrible terror and beautiful beauty, by inviting the sacred into the uncommon. As such, architecture—whether cathedral or non-traditional urban spiritual space—can facilitate awe when it uses form, scale, light, and material to help orchestrate the relationship between believer and divinity.

Other presenters at the conference covered a range of topics relating to religion (from Buddhism to spirituality) and architecture (from Abbey to non-gallery art space), but, as UVa professor and conference chair Louis Nelson pointed out, each paper shared a common thesis: “that space is made sacred by the beliefs and practices of people.” Thus, by examining sacred architecture and the ritual practices invoked by or developed around such buildings, those in attendance began to sketch one way to approach the study and inclusion of “awe” into religion and American material arts.

and evangelical groups (who opt for a one-sided “political” solution).

Dr. Geneviève Zubrzycki analyzed the conflict over the Papal Crosses outside the Auschwitz concentration camp. The conflict has two major dimensions. First, there is the debate over the meaning of the Cross itself. Is it a symbol of Catholic and Polish martyrdom or the evil of the Holocaust? The paper subtly critiqued the secularization of religious symbols through political causes, and how such symbols then gain sacred status as national symbols rather than religious ones.

The paper of Dr. Robert Ingram focused on how eighteenth-century British Atlantic society viewed God and God’s place in the world. Dr. Ingram examined British and American responses to earthquakes in London (1750) and Lisbon (1755) to understand how people reconciled the mechanical universe described by Isaac Newton with their belief in a God who punished, rewarded, and warned humans by regular interventions in the natural world. His work offered a nuanced explanation of the development of the modern distinction between religion and science.
political culture and the normative, foundational framework within which politics takes place. This framework includes the ideals, beliefs, values, symbols, stories, and public rituals that bind people together and direct their common actions. Political matters change all the time; the normative context, by contrast, changes much more slowly. When it does change, however, it has important consequences. By conducting surveys in a continuous series, our aim is to chart shifts in political culture and understand more fully their implications for the boundaries of political legitimacy, the horizons of political possibility, and the future ordering of public life.

The first survey in the series, The State of Disunion, was fielded in 1996; the second, The Politics of Character, was fielded in 2000. In late 2002, the Center on Religion and Democracy and the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture teamed up with the Gallup Organization to conduct the third survey, Difference and Democracy. Especially since the infamous events of September 11, 2001, the issues of cultural difference, tolerance, and public order have been raised with fresh urgency. How divided are we as a nation? What are the issues that most deeply divide us? Equally important, where do we find points of commonality and agreement in the national consciousness? Are unity and division mutually exclusive or do they coexist? Difference and Democracy examines these questions with great care for the simple reason that so much is at stake. We face challenges as new as they are daunting.

Difference and Democracy was based on a “hybrid” research design. A brief, nationally representative phone survey was used to recruit participants to complete a 235-question mail survey. Between October 20, 2002 and January 6, 2003, a total of 1,724 American adults (18 and over) completed and returned their questionnaires. The following observations by Carl Bowman, Professor of Sociology at Bridgewater College and Director of Survey Research for the Center/Institute, are based on some preliminary data analysis. Further results will be forthcoming this spring.

Discussions of cultural diversity in the United States traditionally juxtapose two models or visions of the ideal future. One is the so-called “melting pot,” where the emphasis is on all Americans assimilating social and cultural differences into a blended amalgam. Through most of American history this has been the dominant vision. The second is a more pluralist or “salad bowl” model in which the stress is laid on diverse groups preserving their cultural uniqueness. This is the model associated in recent years with multiculturalism. Initial findings from our “Difference and Democracy” survey reveal that neither of these images by itself expresses the deepest longings of Americans for our nation’s future.

Respondents were asked a series of questions exploring which of the two opposing visions for the future came closest to their own. Americans overwhelmingly look to a future in which: Americans will stand strongly behind their personal convictions (87%); they will be more religious, rather than more secular (71%); the lines between good and bad will be firmer, rather than more flexible (76%); Americans will be more

```
Salad Bowl and Melting Pot

| Americans will speak many languages |
| American families will take many different forms |
| America will be a mix of people of many faiths |
| America will be more unified in their moral commitments |
| America will be more religious |
| Americans will be more courteous in public |
| The lines between good and bad will be firmer |
```

```
Percent of Americans
```

- Americans will speak many languages
- American families will take many different forms
- America will be a mix of people of many faiths
- America will be more unified in their moral commitments
- America will be more religious
- Americans will be more courteous in public
- The lines between good and bad will be firmer
courteous and respectful, rather than more relaxed in their habits (76%); and they will have more unity of moral commitment, rather than more diversity (60%). In each of these areas, Americans have a centripetal urge; they hope to be bound together by common moral goals undergirded by a religious sensibility. The pluralist dream of cultural groups being left to their own designs, stitched together loosely in a secular, civil society would appear to have little popular resonance.

But then we encounter an alternate vision. Over half of those surveyed (53%) hope that America will be a land where many languages are spoken, rather than English alone. Six in ten Americans wish for the American family to take many forms, rather than to conform to a traditional model. And though Americans desire to live in a nation where people are religious, only one in four prefers the image of a “Christian nation” to one in which “America will be a mix of people of many faiths.” Add to this the preference for a land in which there will be less government involvement in people’s lives (72%), and we see a vision of a country in which people, and groups, are free to live their own lives, whatever their cultural heritage or religious “preference.”

These two visions for the future—one that yearns for common commitments, and the other, cultural and religious diversity—are distributed unevenly between age groups, regions of the country, and metropolitan and rural areas, but the lines are not as predictable as one might guess. Almost as many senior citizens as young adults, for example, embrace the diversity vision, while two-thirds of Northeasterners share the longing for a more religious rather than a more secular nation. In fact, the picture is complicated and most Americans do not subscribe solely to one model or the other. Nearly four out of every ten (38%) who wished for more diversity of moral commitment also wished for an English-only America. And nearly half (46%) of those who hoped for more unity of moral commitment hoped for a nation in which many languages would be spoken.

In short, most Americans seek some balance or tension between commonality and diversity. Neither of the standard models, the melting pot or the salad bowl, do a good job of distilling this tension. A satellite or solar system is perhaps a better model for the ideal: one in which cultural groups have their own trajectories and orbits, but in which there is enough moral “gravity” at the center to keep things orderly, both preventing Americans from flying completely off in their own direction and from bumping haphazardly into each other. Analyzing this tension between commonality and diversity will be a central focus of our exploration of the Difference and Democracy findings in the coming months.

In short, most Americans seek some balance or tension between commonality and diversity.

Lines of Opinion Regarding the American Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>65 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent who hope American families will take many forms rather than conforming to a traditional pattern</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey 5
On November 7 and 8, 2002, the Center on Religion and Democracy inaugurated the annual Levinson Lectures on Religion, Culture, and Social Theory. Over 900 people attended the two-day event, which began with a keynote presentation by Samuel P. Huntington. Professor Huntington, who teaches government at Harvard University and has served as advisor to Presidents Nixon and Carter, addressed the central role that culture and religion now play in global economics and politics. Huntington claimed: “We’re living in a new world, but not one that dates from September 11.” Instead, he suggested that the decline of the Soviet Union as a superpower has led to this new world.

Huntington described three characteristics of the new global politics. First, the world no longer lives under a bipolar power structure. The United States is now the only superpower, with regional powers that join with the U.S. to exercise rule in their area of affairs. Second, culture, including religion, has replaced ideology as the primary shaper of global conflict. This can be seen clearly in struggles in the Middle East, such as the Arab-Israeli conflict and Islamic fundamentalist insurgency. Third, conflict predominantly will occur in the form of civil and communal wars, such as in the Sudan. Huntington summed up his description of this new order as a “Cold World,” not a “Cold War.” And in such a world, the United States is powerful, but also vulnerable and isolated. Huntington warned that the U.S. mainland is at continued risk of attack.

The following morning, former French Prime Minister Lionel Jospin and Mr. Robert Kaplan, correspondent for The Atlantic Monthly, returned to the topic of American power, addressing the question of America’s role in the world from the perspective of a practitioner and studied observer.

Prime Minister Jospin, in his first public appearance since leaving office, argued that Europeans and Americans do not share the same view, “or even occupy the same world,” on the issue of power. Jospin stated that Europeans are moving beyond power toward cooperation, while the U.S. still utilizes military power to enforce stability in areas where international laws are unreliable. Jospin viewed American power ambiguously. He conceded that the U.S. provides stability and security in many situations; however, it also lacks a balancing control. Thus, Jospin indicated agreement with the U.S. response after 9/11 because a passive response would have led to world destabilization. But he did not believe that acting militarily against another sovereign nation was appropriate, unless it harbored terrorists and the action was multilateral. He pointed out that, although the U.S. has the ability to act alone, it should work with other states to fight terrorism, as well as to overcome poverty, steady the international financial situation, and stabilize global ecology.

Mr. Kaplan, journalist and author of Balkan Ghosts about conflict in the former Yugoslavia, argued that American imperialism is a reality, not a question. This is true, in large part, because of the “style and attitude” of the U.S. military, whose forces are professional, volunteer, and career-oriented. Such imperialism, however, is not necessarily illiberal because the U.S. helps to safeguard countries making the transition to democracy. As such, the U.S. and its citizens should not be too suspicious of power. According to Kaplan, it was such fear that led to European ethnic cleansings. He warned, however, that U.S. imperialism is most acceptable, and therefore effective, when it operates through the U.N. and other multilateral, international organizations.
What is the topic of your dissertation?

My dissertation looks at why democratic states abandon their international commitments. I look specifically at twentieth-century U.S. military assistance and foreign aid pledges to close strategic friends and allies, and then also look at British relations during the nineteenth century. I examine U.S. relations with Chile in 1976 and Argentina in 1977; the British case involves the Ottoman Empire in the 1870s. The question I’m asking in these particular instances is: Why did these democracies terminate certain commitments to close friends, close allies, important partners?

Scholars often talk about the fact that democracies are especially reliable once they make commitments. But no one has really tracked the follow-up. In fact, promises do get broken and commitments are ended.

Looking within the democratic state, I found that legislatures, in particular, force the severance of ties to close friends. Legislatures represent the central repository of humanitarian values within democratic states—more so than the executive branch, because presidents are typically focused on foreign policies that protect the nation rather than on humanitarian issues. When allies take steps to violate these values and interest groups apply pressure for policy change, democratic legislatures act to overturn certain foreign policy commitments. For instance, the United States pledged in 1952 to provide Chile with military assistance, and did so for more than two decades. Following the rise of the Pinochet regime, however, Congress terminated military assistance in light of both major human rights violations—torture, summary executions, political imprisonments—and pressure from humanitarian nongovernmental organizations, such as Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists.

Is your study, in part, a study of social movements?

My emphasis is on how and when social movements are most likely to have an impact on shaping state policy, rather than, say, on the movements themselves or their specific dynamics. Movement scholars, for instance, have looked at the anti-apartheid movement in the 1980s, the Free South Africa movement. But few have gone on to examine how that movement impacted the U.S. government. We don’t really understand why the movement actually came to fruition when it did (there had been some anti-apartheid sentiment within various interest groups for a decade or two) or why it so powerfully determined the shape of U.S. policy in 1984-86. My particular interest was in this latter question, the question of the intersection of social movements with certain aspects of the policy process.

What got you interested in this topic?

I was interested in examining the concrete ways in which issues associated with the human person come to impact the foreign policies of democratic states. Humanitarianism is an aspect of the liberal democratic culture in American society, as well as other European democracies, for instance. This fact has been established by various scholars. But otherwise we know very little about how and when humanitarian issues come to the fore in democratic foreign policy, especially when dealing with close allies and friends. Why is it, for instance, that some allies get punished for inhumane behavior while others do not? What are the political and institutional forces within democratic states that press these issues to the heart of the policy process? My work tries to shed light on these types of questions.

Continued on page 8
Any surprise findings along the way?

I was surprised at how consistently certain patterns replayed themselves. In the British case, the government pledged itself to protect the integrity of the Ottoman Empire following the Crimean War. Twenty years later, in 1877, Britain overturned this pledge by standing aside as Russia attacked the Balkans. Much like the U.S. Congress in the 1970s with respect to Chile, the British Parliament was responsible for this policy shift. The Parliament moved to end the Crimean War pledge following the Ottoman slaughter of thousands of innocent civilians in the Balkans and a major popular movement within Britain to disassociate from the Turks. Various democratic legislatures at different points in modern history demonstrate the very same pattern, showing that when you have the combined force of a partner/ally country being exceedingly inhumane and a lot of domestic pressure from different groups to change or end an existing commitment, then the legislative consequences will often be the same. I found that fascinating.

Where do you go from here?

Now I’m starting to look at other democracies—other European countries, Japan—to see if I find the same patterns. In the future I will follow the project on a slightly different level. Humanitarianism manifests itself in different forms, in different democracies, at different points in history. I’m interested in looking at where these movements come from, their timing, and why some democratic countries get very interested in a particular issue while others could seemingly care less. It’s following up on the dissertation project by looking at the humanitarian issue a little earlier in the chain of events. The next step is to look at the ways that norms and values take shape in the legislative process and become very pertinent in one state versus another.

Oxford Conference Considers Theology and Science

On July 23–26, 2002, a distinguished group of theologians and philosophers convened at St. Stephen’s House, Oxford University, for a conference titled “Illumination: Reason, Revelation, and Science.” The Center on Religion and Democracy, which sent two representatives, helped underwrite this important event.

From the outset, conference organizers John Milbank and Graham Ward shaped the conversation as an exploration of the recent turn to theology by scholars in a number of academic disciplines in Britain and America. The conference showcased the work of both established and upcoming scholars who are opening new pathways in their research by utilizing theology.

Keynote speakers for the conference were John Barton, David Burrell, Fergus Kerr, Nancey Murphy, Stanley Rosen, Charles Taylor, and Rowan Williams. This array of scholarly interests—from the Biblical studies of Barton, to the philosophy of Rosen, Murphy, and Taylor, to the theology of Williams, the newly confirmed Archbishop of Canterbury—marked the conference as a major interdisciplinary collaboration. This collaboration was unique in that the participants shared a willingness to redefine old, sometimes tired scholarly questions with the freshness of theological perspective.

Perhaps the most important discovery stemming from the new theological emphasis, according to Archbishop Williams and Professor Kerr, is the admission of the centrality of intuitive knowledge in scholarly methods. Not only do scholars deduce their various conclusions from fact and perception, but a good scholarly work also relies upon a mysterious illumination of the scholar’s mind—an illumination that only theology can account for. Thus, theology offers a potentially vital addition to the scientific method shaped by Enlightenment principles and ideals.

Institute Associate Fellow Wilson Brissett presented a paper entitled, “Magnetic Mercy: Employing Desire Beyond Self.” Justin Holcomb, a Center Postdoctoral Fellow, presented a paper entitled, “Brilliant Darkness: Dionysius on Light, Sight, and Prayer.” These papers will be included in the two-volume proceedings to be published by Routledge.
As the opening passages of Jean Elshtain’s most recent book indicate, Jane Addams’ legacy as a shaper of modern democratic life has nearly been forgotten. Best known for founding Hull House, a social and civic settlement in an Italian immigrant neighborhood of Chicago, Addams was also a prolific essayist, a literary scholar of sorts, a prominent political figure, and a theorist of democracy. Elshtain’s goal in revisiting the life of Jane Addams, who has been written about by many other historians and biographers, is to trace her civic leadership to the books she read, her travels, and her encounters with the immigrant poor.

Elshtain highlights the tendency of Addams’ biographers and critics to oversimplify Addams’ work by interpreting it through contemporary lenses. Sweeping away these assumptions, Elshtain offers a depiction of Addams’ development as a civic leader—a depiction that is intertwined with the literature that Addams studied and wrote throughout her life. John Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* is the centerpiece of this narrative, providing a metaphor for Addams’ own journey from the small town of Cedarville, Illinois, to her very public life in Chicago.

Literature alone did not inspire Jane Addams as a social activist. Elshtain traces the envisioning of Hull House to Addams’ encounters with starving poor people during her travels in Europe. Later, her life at Hull House was marked by daily visits to her neighbors in Chicago’s immigrant districts. Elshtain’s portrayal of Addams’ relationship to these neighbors is best described by the title of the book’s fifth chapter: “Compassion Without Condescension.” Throughout Jane Addams’ many years at Hull House, and in all the many activities that occurred there, the participants were never treated as clients or recipients, but as “citizens-in-the-making.”

It follows then that this book is less a biography than a model for the making of a democratic citizen. Elshtain, the University of Chicago ethicist, herself a theorist of democracy, writes the life of Jane Addams in terms of the fashioning of a civic leader. The audience for this book is anyone who is pursuing the ideals of democracy. Parents will find in this book a path for raising their children as citizens. Educators will find the book rich with pedagogical implications. Literary scholars and sociologists of culture will prize the book for its demonstration of how literature can shape a life. Social leaders and reformers will discover a fresh model for civic life. In the hands of Elshtain, Jane Addams’ vision for American democracy becomes both a footpath for the citizen and a blueprint for the American project.

*Strategic Narrative: New Perspectives on the Power of Personal and Cultural Stories* address the real and far-reaching affects of narrative in everyday life. Positing the power and intentionality of narrative—its strategic uses—the essays reveal how we use our ways of telling to reclaim, evaluate, and draw meaning from our experiences in an increasingly complex world. The book brings together diverse perspectives from a range of disciplines to address such topics of narrative as resistance, self-construction, imagination, and ethics.

Joseph E. Davis, Program Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture, authored the chapter, “Social Movements and Strategic Narratives: Creating the Sexual Abuse Survivor Account.”

Dustin M. Kidd is a doctoral candidate in sociology and a Fellow of the Institute. His dissertation examines controversies surrounding public funding for the arts.
In the wake of World War II, conflict surfaced within liberal intellectual thought between a global concern for cultural diversity and a characteristically American passion for individual liberation. While anthropologists adopted newfound respect for diverse cultures, intellectuals simultaneously characterized the particularity of these cultures as a repressive conformity that infringed upon individual freedom. In *A World Made Safe for Differences*, Christopher Shannon argues that, far from signaling a deep-seated respect for diversity, these new intellectual investigations of culture simply represented a modification of modern, Western individualism, where the concept of culture became little more than a synonym for diversity of individual lifestyles.

Secular social science made such a thin, individualistic view of culture possible. Widely accepted as the tool of choice to combat Victorian ignorance and repression, social science complied with an inherently modern view of the self. Demanding a formal stance of objective detachment, secular social science mirrored the Western myth of individual autonomy by constantly transcending its object of study. Thus, the intellectual ferment of the Cold War era can be seen as the product of a common cultural inheritance rather than a period of genuine cultural change, with mid-century anthropologists, liberals, radicals, and civil rights leaders all relying on modern narratives of the autonomous self and the inexorable progress of humanity from repression to liberation.

Careful to heed his own warnings, Shannon situates himself firmly in the Catholic tradition of natural law, arguing that in the twentieth century, Catholicism has posed the only real alternative to this dominant modern discourse. Yet the cultural vision of Catholicism is inherently at odds with the tenets of multiculturalism, and Shannon concludes with a call for a measure of cultural separatism on the local level as the best means of maintaining genuine diversity and reinvigorating American public life.

For a short book, *A World Made Safe for Differences* is very rich, both with historical and cultural details and with analytical depth. More an “antihistory,” as Shannon calls it, than a comprehensive intellectual history, the book demonstrates in compelling fashion that the major oppositional voices of the liberal intellectual elite in the mid-twentieth century were all utilizing the common discourse of individualism. And while its constructive vision remains somewhat underdeveloped, *A World Made Safe* provides a valuable critical lens for thinking about contemporary multiculturalism and its prevailing discourse of tolerance.

Patrick LaRochelle is a Research Associate at the Center on Religion and Democracy.

---

**New Publication**

**Recreating the American Republic**

Charles A. Kromkowski

Rules of apportionment—those laws and systems set up to distribute collective decision-making authority—are vital elements of every social and political order. Such rules determine not only how collective decisions are made and by whom, but also how and why a particular constitutional order develops over time. *Recreating the American Republic* provides a far-reaching analysis of when, how, and why these rules change and with what consequences. By engaging three events of American political history—the American Revolution; the 1787 Constitutional Convention; and the American Civil War—the book reveals the special import of apportionment rules, constructing a unique history of American political development from 1700 to 1870. Charles A. Kromkowski is Lecturer in the Department of Politics at the University of Virginia and a Faculty Fellow of the Center on Religion and Democracy.
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Calendar of Events

IASC Spring Colloquium: The Commodification of Everything

Thursday, February 13*
Juliet Schor, Boston University
“From Cool to Commodified: Targeting the American Child”

Thursday, February 27*
George Ritzer, University of Maryland
“The Globalization of Nothing”

Thursday, March 13*
David Lyon, Queen’s University
“Commodification, Classification, and the Culture of Control”

Friday, March 21†
Graham Ward, University of Manchester
“The Commodification of Religion”

Thursday, April 10*
Kiku Adatto, Harvard University
“Selling Out Childhood”
Michael Sandel, Harvard University
“Are There Some Things that Money Can’t Buy?: The Moral Limits of Markets”

* 3:30pm in Minor Hall
† Professor Ward will speak at 3:30pm in Commonwealth Room, Newcomb Hall