

BOSTON COLLEGE

BOISI CENTER

AND AMERICAN PUBLIC LIFE

v yggvu" y jkng" v jg" rcpgn" y cu" i qkpi. "uq" yg" ecpø" v yggv" swgukqpu" vq" jgt. "dvw"
jqrghwnn{ " {qwønn" jcxg" swgukqpu" cpf" kpuki jvu" cu" y gnn" htq o" v jg" rcpgn" y jkng"
{qwøtg" v yggvkpi 0

v jgtgøu" c" tgcfkpi" i tqwr" jgtg" y jq" jcu" lwuv" tgc f" {qwt" dqqm. "uq" Kø o "uwtg"
v jg {øm" dg" xgt { "j c r r { "vq" gp i c i g" {qw" kp" eqpxgtucvkqp0""Uq" y gneq o g" cnuq0

Next is Randy Kennedy, who is the Michael Klein Professor at Harvard
L

Cornille: So in light of the common good, is maybe creating a sphere broad enough to allow the different religious communities to flourish as authentically as possible. Is this one way of framing the idea of the common good in our pluralistic context? Or what are other models of possibly doing this?

Patton: Yes. The common good, which has to do with not only that strangers are inevitable, but there will be more and different what we need to build up, is a kind of pragmatism of everyday life, a about.

And he said something very interesting. He said, yeah, I live in the woods And he was right. So one of the things that I was interested in talking to Dean Quigley earlier this morning is the role of the city, I think, cannot be underestimated. And particularly, if we think about a common good from a religious perspective, something different is happening, of course, all over the United States. We know this. There are ashrams and really interesting Buddhist centers in North Georgia where I frequently travel.

But I do think that the legal questions of everyday life and of common life and the pragmatic questions of everyday life do take shape differently in the city now. And I think the next step for us in thinking about the common good inter-religiously has to do with really looking at the differences in inter-religious engagement in the city and in rural America.

Putnam and Campbell have this really interesting way of talking about my pal Al, who happens to be, and you fill in the blank. And the fact that we run into strangers, to people who are outside our immediate communities, is one of those important pieces that I think we have to pay attention to. How do we create habits of everyday life that make it possible for us not to be afraid of the people we encounter who are not like us?

But the other place where that kind of pragmatic interaction has taken place is in any kind of organization that brings people together around a common cause. And typically, in our inner cities but also beyond cities, religious communities have been places that are sort of nodes of organizing. So a few people from this religious community and a few people from this one and a few people from this one and a few people from that one all get together because they have a common concern in the larger community that brings them together. And it is those partnerships that have been able to do the bridging work across our very particular religious traditions.

Aslan: If I may, let me give an interesting example of what Nancy just mentioned, and it goes back to what I was saying before about these anti-Sharia legislations. The original form of the legislation and what was so immediately problematic about it was that it targeted Sharia specifically. It actually used the word Sharia. And so it was very easily overturned because the argument could be made that it was denying First Amendment rights to a particular religious community that other religious communities could have.

So the author of this legislation, a man by the name of David Yerushalmi, who happens to be an Orthodox Jew, changed the legislation to make it more general. Remove the word Sharia and talked about foreign law, foreign religious law. And what happened is that the Orthodox Jewish community in the United States rebelled against the law and actually joined forces with Muslim communities in these various states to fight the law because this law, which was written by their fellow Orthodox Jew for very clearly anti-Muslim purposes, was affecting them. And so you have this very interesting unity being formed based on these common interests that I think in most cases probably would not have formed, as a result of an attempt at obvious bigotry and bias.

Cornille: So if we talk about pragmatic pluralism, though, and these kinds of situations of self-

buried. And she did it for entirely Jewish reasons, but everybody who wanted her to do that came to sit with her. So Muslims came, Buddhists came, secular folk came, whoever. And they needed her to be Jewish in that moment and do that mourning ritual with them.

And there are many, many other really inspiring stories like this. I think another religion to be itself. There are three really wonderful stories in the last six months in the newspaper. We have one up in Ahmedabad, was trained in Hong Kong, and he is one of the few people who know how to do kosher suits in a really wonderful way in New York.

And we have a more dramatic example of the Chinese community, that is elderly Chinese are feeling oppressed by folk who pretend to be seers within the community and solve problems but cost a lot of money, and the shomrim, Jewish protectors, are now protecting the elderly Chinese community against that within their own community.

months, where people are getting together in these really interesting ways because they need the other religion simply to be itself. And I think that that pushes against the idea that there is a common good that someone interdependence upon which I think we really need to reflect more on would even be the people involved in those kinds of interdependencies I would agree with you that we need another term for those spontaneous forms of interdependency.

this that is very, very important, which is what do you lose in a common good? Every religious tradition who then becomes part of a common good or a public good there is a tragedy every religious tradition does have to give up in order to become part of an American public. And I think that could be our next stage, in a way, of reflection.

Cornille: Maybe we can come back to that question in a minute, but you brought up the example of the common good as something that appears ad hoc a particular situation where we need one another. Usually you think of the

common good as a big system almost that is in place and that somebody
jcu"etgcvgf."y jkej "K" fqpøv"vj kpm"ku"vjg"ecug"gkv jgt0""K"vj kpm"kvøu"c"xgt {"qrgp"
term at this stage, certainly.

So besides these ad hoc situations, what would be ideal situations where
the definition or the understanding of the common good can take shape,
ecp"igv"uq o g"oqtg"eqpvgpvuA"" J q y"yqwnf"vjqug"eq o g"cdqwwA"" Y gøxg
talked about several negative situations. We can also talk about how do
we fill it in, but what would be the context in which we can fill in that
term or that category of the common good?

Aslan: Well, I think about a friend and colleague of mine, Eboo Patel. Some of
you may be familiar with him. He started an organization in Chicago
called Interfaith Youth Core, the purpose of which is to bring young
people of different religious backgrounds together not to dialogue, which I
find very interesting. T j g {" fqpøv"ukv"ctqwpf"cpf"jcxg"kpvgthckv j" fkcni w g 0 ""
Kp"ncev."v jgtgøu"xgt {"nkvnng"qh"vjcv"vjcv"vcmgu"rnceg"cv"cm0""Kpuvgcf."vjg {"hqt o "
these missions where they go out and they do good, whether that means
cleaning the streets or helping build a home or feeding people in need.
The emphasis is on action.

And what is remarkable about this is that the bonds that are created by
these shared participatory experiences in the common good in the way that
kvøu" fghkpgf"vjgtg"etgcvgu"dqpfu"vjcv"ctg"het."K"vj kpm."uvtqpgger than any
amount of interfaith dialogue could ever do. He calls it interfaith action.
So that, I think, is a very interesting example, a concrete example of what
{qwøtg"tghgttkpi "vq0

Ammerman: I think sometimes part of what we need to be willing to just trust is the
kind of public that is created within a particular religious community.
Omar referred to some of this this morning, that many religious
communities ó most religious communities are diverse within themselves.
And whenever a group of people is coming together in these kinds of
xqmwvct {"tgnki kqwu"eq o o w p k v g u"cm"ctqwpf"wu."vjg {"øtg"jcxkpi "vq" hki wtg"qww"
how to organize themselves and how to solve their differences, how to
govern themselves. And those experiences in and of themselves, within
those somewhat sheltered publics, can also contribute the skills that are
necessary, the habits that are necessary for participation in the larger
community beyond those enclaves.

I think we need to trust both that process and the fact that, as Laurie said,
we need Jews to be Jews. And in these projects together, these are people

eq o kpi "vq i gv jgt." p qv "vt { kpi "vq "vgm"v jg" r gq r ng" p g z v "vq"v jg o." y g m n." y g ø t g"
t g c m { "c n n"v j g"u c o g 0"" Y g ø t g"v g m k p i "g c e j" q v j g t"q w t"u v q t k g u"v j c v"c t g"q w t"x g t {"
particular stories, and finding ways that both the work we do inside our
communities and the very particular stories that we learn and tell and
perpetuate in those communities ó how can they come together then in
these other settings in order to pursue work together?

Patton:

I very much appreciate your pushing us to describe if not an ideal, a
r t g h g t t g f" y c { "q h" d w k n f k p i." d g e c w u g" y g" f q p ø v" f q"v q q" y g m n" c v"v j c v" r t q l g e v 0"" K"
v j k p m"v j c v" k p" i g p g t c n." y g ø t g" c p c n { | k p i "c p f" y g ø t g" o c m k p i "g v j p q i t c r j k g u" c p f"
things, but pushing the normative around us is a huge issue.

I would give two words, and they build on what everyone has contributed
up to this point. One is alliance, and the second is irony. What do I mean
by alliance? I mean that if you think of what happened after the Sikh
tragedy in Wisconsin last year, if you looked at all of the websites from
the Sikh temples around America, you saw ó if there was buried in the
fifth level of the website, what is Sikhism, here is what the government
says about Sikhism, et cetera, suddenly it all went to the top. They were
flashing. And it was a very poignant thing to see how much every Sikh
community or every gurdwara in the United States felt as if they had to
reeducate yet again on every single level.

C p f" K ø o "v j k p m k p i." Q M." v j c v ø u" i t g c v." d w v" u j q w n f p ø v" v j g t g" d g" c p" c n n k c p e g A"
U j q w n f p ø v" v j g t g" d g" c p" c n n k c p e g" q h" g f w e c v q t u A"" K p" v j g" u v w f { "q h" t g n k i k q p."
certainly, we have been debating the insider-outsider dilemma for 25, 30
years now. Who has more authority to say what about a religious
tradition? What if we instead moved into an explicit ideology of alliance
of teaching about Sikhism between insiders and outsiders, so(s)9()-9(a)(r)-6(p)20(e)(t)-21(we

dqwpfct{."cpf"cv"vjcv"rqkpv."K"i wguu"K"dgeq o g"kpvtqngtcpv."cpf"K"fqpøv"hggn" embarrassed to say that. It seems to me intolerance is a very dangerous thing. One needs to be very careful about where one draws boundaries. Bu v" fqpøv"dqwpfctkgu"cv"uq o g"rqkpv"jcxg"vq"dg"ftcy p."kpenwfkpi "gxgp"ykvj" respect to people who are talking religious talk on the other side?

Ammerman: K" jcxg"vq"cf o kv" o {"hktuv"tgurqpug"vq"nkuvgpki "vq" {qwt"nkuv"qh"Mwpiøu" supposedly things we all agree on was, what? We agree on those things? Really?

Cornille: Well, I think what he means is ó actually, those were formulated at one of the more recent meetings of the World Parliament of Religions that was a commemoration of the centenary, actually, of the World Parliament of Religions. And he brought leaders from different communities together to formulate this kind of global ethic. But I think we really do agree fundamentally on those principles. What we disagree on is what they mean.

Ammerman: Exactly. (laughter)

Cornille: So the principles themselves are in some ways vacuous until we look at what actually no killing means for a Buddhist and what it means for a Christian or for people from ó but then it becomes interesting. Again, then the second question that I raised is then is the common good really constituted by the different things that we can contribute to a kind of discourse on some kind of ideal society where different religions contribute distinctively and positively to a greater good? Can we think of it in those terms? Or is that too dreamy?

Patton: I mean, I would say with Randy that we very much live in what Wendy Steiner and others have called the paradox of liberalism, which is that we are deeply tolerant of tolerance and deeply intolerant of intolerance, and that is the paradox of liberalism right there.

Y jgtg"K"ftcy"vjg"nkpg."cpf"K"vj kpm"kvøu" c"xgt {"kpvtgguvkpi "qpg."dgecwug" ygøtg"cm"iqkpi"vq"ftcy"kv"kp"fkhhgtgpv"yc{u"ó cpf"Køf"nqxs"vq"jgct" {qwt" thoughts about this, Randy ó I think in the cultural sphere, we are going to be far more tolerant of intolerance than we are in the legal sphere. And I fqpøv"ycpv"vq"ftcy"cp"cdunwvg"dqwpfct{."qdxkqwun{."dgv yggp"vjqug"vyq." dwv"vjgtg"ku" c"dqwpfct {0""Kvøu"hw | | {0""Dwv"K"yqwnf"nqxs"vq"hear from you a little bit about where you see legal discourse around intolerance moving

K"vj kpm"v jcvøu"y jcvøu"uq"tg o ctmcdng"cdqvw"wu0"Qwt"tgnki kqwu"fkxgtukv {"fqgu" those two things. Paradoxically, it encourages you to adopt your religion as an identity in a much more fervent way than you would if you lived in a majority religious community, and then at the same time, it encourages you to syncretize and acclimate your religion to the American cultural identity that is so pervasive.

Patton: I would absolutely agree with that. I think there are two things that we can say further based on your really insightful points. The first is, if Omar is right that we are ó or we were talking about the work that came out that said wgøtgq k" f Oi"tt"ø

I very intentionally set it up otherwise. And I think that people very different than me in this culture have a similar experience of if you just go with the flow, your life can be very limited in terms of who you encounter and the relationships you have an opportunity to build.

So my question to the panel is what are your thoughts about the requirement to foster a sense of desire and intentionality in people to try to encounter?

Ammerman: I think to begin by responding with a reinforcement of the point you made about how easy it would be not to do this. One of the things that over the last couple of decades is the increasing echo chamber effect, and the increasing degree to which we are able to surround ourselves only with people who think like us, and that that is certainly being found increasingly even in religious communities, that the religious and political alignments are now much more tightly bound than they were a couple of decades ago.

So the need to be intentional, I think, is even greater than it might have

in the high school, so the high school has a scholarship sponsored by the mosque.

So in a way, the whole town ó

Cpf"vq"dg"rgthgevn{"htcpm."v jcvøu"qwt"hcwnv0"" Yg"kp"cecfemia spend far too much time talking to each other, and not enough time talking to everyone gnuq0"" Yg"fqpøv"fq"cxgt{" iqqf"lqd."K"fqpøv"vj kpm."kp"vtcpuncvki"qwt" research and our work to a general audience, to a popular audience. On the contrary, not only do we discourage such things, we tend to actually punish such things.

And I think that it then should not come as a surprise ó and by the way, this is true of almost every academic discipline, not just the study of religion. But I then think it shouldpøv"eq og"cu"cuwtrtkug"vjcv"vjg"tgurqpug" that we get, particularly from the media and from the public, is one of confusion or distrust. I think anyone in this room who is either a student of religion or a teacher of religion has had that experience of being on a rncpg"cpf"jcxkpi"uq oqpg"cum" {qw"y jcv" {qw"fq."cpf" {qw"uc{."Kø o"cu" scholar of religion, and they think, oh, did I swear? Oh, my God. They uvctv"eqphguukpi"vjgkt"ukpu"vq" {qw"dgecwug"vjg{"fqpøv"wpfgtuvcpf"vjcv" {qw" are a social scientist studying a historical phenomenon.

But again, I just have to emphasize this once again ó I think the blame for that resides primarily amongst us. We ourselves need to be engaged in the public marketplace of ideas. We have some very interesting things to say. I alwayu"vgnh \$ pf v k

Sullivan:

K'hgggn"nkmg"Kø o "cv"vqyp" o ggvkpi."uq"K"cnways feel compelled to say my name
y jgp"K"uvctv"urgemkpi."dgecwug"v jcvøu"y jcv" y g"fq0""Fcp"Uwmkxcp0""K" y cpv"vq"
commend Mr. Kennedy, first of all, in line with what Mr. Aslan just said,
that sometimes you have to come down to the level of the people to really
wpfgtuvcpf" y jcvøu" i qkpi"qp"fqyp"vjgtg0""Cpf"jg" y cu"dtcxg"gpqwi j"kp"vjku"
cecfg o ke"gp xktqp o gpv" y jgtg"kvøu"uwr rqugf"vq"dg"htgg-flowing ideas to say
that there are supposed to be boundaries, too. So I commend you for
bringing that perspective to the discussion, Mr. Kennedy.

What I wanted to address as far as diversity goes is the huge problem we
have as citizens, especially in light of the Islamic world, where I hear on
National Public Radio that 33 medical people have been assassinated by
the Taliban in Afghanistan for giving measles and other vaccines to
children. And we roll our eyes and shake our heads and say how
incredibly foolish and murderous this is, until the second half of the story,
when you find out they believed that these medical technicians from the
West are withdrawing DNA samples so that they can establish genetic
links to Taliban and Al-Qaeda leaders. And then you say, oh my
i qqfpguu."vjku"ku"cpqv jgt" y c{"v jcv" y gøxg"qh hgpfgf"vjgk"ewnwtg"cpf" y gøxg"
gone looking for culprits to murder.

Uq"Kø o "uc{kpi"v jcv"qwt"swguv"ht"fkxgtukv{"cpf"wpfgo kpi"qh v q ò cu"vq"

to have something that is lifelong, a relationship, whatever its basis might be that I think a direct answer to your question would be the number one byproduct I see from these small engagements is memory.

For example, the person who holds the keys to the Holy Sepulcher is a Muslim. And that happened because of the Crusades, but eventually all the Christian groups that you know what would happen if one Christian group had the keys to the Holy Sepulcher, right? So what you see is that that is a hereditary position now amongst Muslims, and Christians need him to be a Muslim.

And he has memory of liturgical changes around the different denominations, changes in liturgy that happened over the course of the centuries, and his family does, too, in a way that no single Christian group does. So if you read interviews with him, he will tell you that, well, the Baptists did that one time, or the Greeks Orthodox did that, and now they switched, and so on. So he has a form of Christian memory that no single individual Christian group could have.

Another wonderful example is the Ner Tamid, the Eternal Light in the Jewish tradition. There was a synagogue that needed a place to worship in across America. I think the stories that emerge out of hospitality because of an itinerant religious group are extraordinary, and someone needs to write a book about them. This is a very small, bite-sized example, but that synagogue grew enough to have its own building, but that church still has hospitable to the Jews in this very interesting way.

And so that is the kind of thing that I think is really important, because as soon as religions begin to tell stories about themselves that have to do with civic life, as well.

Burgard:

for a second, because I was on the editorial board of *The Los Angeles Times* around the time of the 2001 attacks. And as we looked at the Islamic community, we were trying to figure out why there

was such a sense of silence on the part of this group of new Americans in the face of what violent Islam had done in the name of their faith.

So part one of my question is ó

And so I think where I would want to push us is to have each religious tradition from within its own idioms articulate those questions of the common good in a particular way as part of the clarion call to move forward. And then I think you do need to think about what those larger global ethics would look like in international court tribunals, in the Kyoto Accords, et cetera, et cetera. Applying those to very specific international fora would be the way that I would move.

Ammerman: K"vj kpm"kvøu"tgcmm{"k o rqtvcpv"vq"tgeq i pk|g"vj cv"uq o gv k o gu"vj g"uq-called bite-sized projects are actually quite global in scope.

Cornille: Someone way, way back.

Reda: O {"pc o g"ku"Oqjc o o cf" Tgfc0""Kø o "htq o "vj g"Kunc o ke"Egpvgt"qh"Dquvqp0""
And I want to ask, how many people were here in Boston on September 11? OK, there are enough people. Anybody seen me or seen anybody from the Islamic Center on the media in Boston? And actually, it was in v j g" o g fkc."dww"rgq r ng" fqpøv"rc {"cvvgpvkqp"vq"vj cv0

On the day of September 11, the religious leaders of all congregations, we met together to have joint prayers for the victims. And we did that all together. I was here. In Boston College, we had in the archdiocese ó actually outside the

Ammerman: Cpf"kupøv"v jcv"cp"kpvgtguvkpi"gejq"qh" gctnkg"vk o gu"kp"qwt" j kuvqt{"y jgp" many, many immigrant groups that have come here from societies in which democratic participation was not normal? And interestingly, often v j tqw i j"qti cpk|kpi"kp"vjgk"tgnki kqwu"eq o o wpkvkgu."v jcvøu"dgpp"qpg"qh"v jg" dtkf i g"urcegu"kp"y jke j"v jg{øxg"ngctpgf"v jg"y c{"u"qh"rctvkekr cving in American civic life.

Cornille: Erik?

Owens: Hi, thank you all. One of the working assumptions of scholars and maybe many other people, as well, is that if we learn to talk about our deepest fkhhtgpegu."y gønn"dg"dgvggt"qhh."y jgv jgt"v jcvøu"v jgological differences or racial or cultural or whatever. I wonder if you panelists agree with that rtg o kug."cpf"kh"uq."j qy" {qw"y qwnf"lwf i g"qwt"uqekgv{øu"rtqi tguu"qp"v jcv" o ctmA""Cpf"y j qøu"tgurqpukdng"ht" o cmkpi"v jcv"j cr rgpA""Kh"v jcv"ku"kpfggf" the case, that talking about our deepest differences will help us somehow vq"nkxg"y kvj"v jqug" fkhhtgpegu."pqv"rcrgt"v jg o"qxgt"y kvj"v jg"kfgc"v jcv"y gøtg" all the same in some way ó Abrahamic traditions or Americans or whatever ó but talk about differences ó how well are we doing on that and y j qøu"tgurqpukdknv {"ku"kvA""Ku"kv" PRTA""Ku"kv"v jg"rctgpvua""Ku"kv"ejwte jgu"qt" what?

Ammerman: K"y qwnf"uc {"v jcv"K"v jkpm"vcnmkpi"cdqww" fkhhtgpegu"ku"ko rqtvcpv."dww"v jcvøu" pqv"v jg"htuv"rnceg" {qw"uvctv0""Owe j"qh"y jcv"y gøxg"dgpp"vcnmkpi" about for v jg"ncuv"j qy gxgt"nqpi"y gøxg"dgpp"wr"jgtg"ku"v jg"y c{"kp"y jke j" relationships and joint shared work are the places out of which enough trust is built to be able to then talk about the kind of deep religious differences that we may have. My gut feeling about things is that if you uvctv"y kvj"ngvøu"jcxg"ceqpxgtucvkqp"cdqww"j qy" o we j"y g"fkuc i tgg"cdqww"Z." Y, or Z, that may not get you very far.

Kennedy: Kø o"cnm"ht"vcnmkpi"cdqww" fkhhtgpegu."dww"kvøu"pqv"dcugf"qp"uq o g"pqvkqp"v jcv" if we talk about espgekcn {"tcfkecn" fkhhtgpegu."y gøtg"i qkpi"vq"dg"cdng"vq" igv"cnqpi"dgvggt."v jcv"v jgtgøu"i qkpi"vq"dg"uq o g"uqtv"qh"wr u jqv"kp"vgt o u"qh" dgvggt"fc {"vq"fc {"nkhg0""Y gøtg"urgcmkpi"kp"v jg"dquq o"qh"ci"tgcv"wpkxgtukv {"0"" Kø o"kpvgtgugvf"kp"vcnmkpi"cdqww"v jkpiu"y jke j"ctg"important and talking cdqww"v jkpiu"y jke j"ctg"kpvgtguvkpi."cpf"v jcvøu"y jcv"kpvgnggevwcnu"fq0""Cpf"kv" o ki jv"uq o gvk o gu"dg"v jcv"v jgtgøu"ceqmcvgtcn"ghhgev0""Uq o g"rgqrng."kp"hcev." o c {"dg"cdng"vq"nkxg"dgvggt"kp"v jg"chvgt o cvj"qh"uwe j"ce"vcmm0""Cpf"kh"v jcvøu" true, good.

Dwv"htcpmn{. "kh"kvøu"pqv"vtwg"ó cpf" o {"dgnkgh"ku" r tqdcdn{"v j cv"xgt {"qhvgp."kvøu" not true ó v j cvøu"pqv" i qkpi "vq" fc o r gp" o {"kpukuvgpeg"wrqp"fqkpi "kv."dgecwug" my insistence upon doing it is not actually predicated on there being a day to day life payoff.

Patton: I would say that there are some very interesting studies that suggest in sociolinguistics that if you begin with the assumption of difference and the purpose of the talk between people is to discover similarities, that relationship is going to last longer than if the assumption is similarity and the talk is about difference. So I would be more in favor of making sure that we begin with an assumption of difference, which is obvious at a certain level, and then move to an exploration of the similarities that are surprising, which is very different than a kind of triumphalism around similarity, which happens so often in interfaith discourse.

There was a wonderful example of that in the World Parliament of Religions, the 100th anniversary, where there was a big debate between two or three religious groups about who was more tolerant than the other. Kvøu" c"xgt {"vqw i j"eqpxgtucvkqp"vq" jcxg."tki j vA

The other thing I would say that is very important from my perspective in vgt ou"qh" j q y" y gøtg"fqkpi is I think for every generation in American history, there is one religion that bears the brunt of the conversation about fkhgtgpeg0"" Y g"lwuv"ucy "kv0""Kvøu"Kunc o "tki j v"pq y 0""Dghqtg"v j cv."kv" y cu" Catholicism. Before that, it was Native American. You can define your periods how you want. But I do think that part of the reason for that is because we do want one institution or one group to take care of that conversation for us, almost.

And I think we need to move beyond that to that question of the shared cultural burden, so that every institution that we have is going to be talking cdqvw"tgnki kqwu" fkhgtgpeg0""Kvøu"pqv"lwuv" PRT."dwv"kvøu"v j g"hc o kn {"cpf"kvøu" the schools and all those kinds of things. And that gets back to the intentionality that we were talking about earlier.

I also think that we would do really well if we talked better about the great unmentionable in American society still which is class. Talk about an assumed difference. And I think if we integrated into religious conversations, which tend to be very middle-class, with questions about class difference in society, we would have an entirely different kind of conversation, and I would hope that we move in that direction.

Ammerman: I want to say one more word on this subject. One of the things that has been striking me in our conversation all day long is that there have been times in American history where we have been able and willing to expand our sense of diversity and other times when we have wanted to contract our sense of who we are religiously and otherwise, and that those times have probably coincided with times of relative more and less sense of a threat versus hope, and that maybe the way in which we tend to our ability to encompass more diversity is not by focusing on the diversity, but by

be involving the School of Law and the School of Business, beccwug"kvøu"

