

issues of race, poverty, and anti-Semitism, and on through women's ordination and the ordination of noncelibate gays and lesbians. He long ago acquired the habit of writing books; this is his 17th.

Unlike Coffin, Spong has devoted himself to fighting the good fight within his church. *Here I Stand* gives an inside account of various political struggles in Spong's early parishes, his diocese, and the Episcopal House of Bishops; he does not hesitate to blast his reactionary opponents and scold his pusillanimous allies by name. There is material here for a latter-day Trollope, but Spong possesses neither the literary gift nor the sense of humor to pull it off. St. Peter may read him a lesson on humility before letting him through the Pearly Gates.

Spong's war for the soul of Episcopalianism may strike some as too churchly by half, but he has a sharp footnote for ecclesiastics who would devote themselves to issuing pious public pronouncements on issues such as Third World debt: "Church leaders possess little political or economic power to bear on this subject. So talk is cheap, costing the leaders nothing."

Which brings us to Jim Wallis, the ghost of Christian Liberalism Future—maybe. Wallis is Exhibit A in the small display cabinet of contemporary liberal evangelicals. Preacher, activist, editor of *Sojourners* magazine, he lives and works in a poor neighborhood of Washington, D.C., and for years has labored to spread the word of religiously motivated social action for the poor.

His time may be now, and he knows it. Thanks to the "charitable choice" provision of the 1996 welfare reform act—which encourages government funding of religious organizations providing services to welfare recipients—politicians and policy mavens have become enamored of "faith-based" approaches to the nation's social problems. And with this timely though preachy book, Wallis is johnny-on-the-spot.

He makes clear that he opposed the welfare reform act and worries that taking Caesar's coin will rob faith-based social service providers of their prophetic voices. He does not claim to have all the answers. But you can feel his excitement at the prospect of assembling a coalition of hands-on social activists that bridges the divide between the liberal and evangelical churches.

Whether this signals a new Protestant Left is very much an open question. The answer will depend on the willingness of liberal church leaders to rethink their views on the separation of church and state, of conservative church leaders to rethink their views on the evils of government, and of people in the pews to rethink their commitment to the gospel of wealth.

—Mark Silk

***DIVERSITY AND DISTRUST:  
Civic Education in a Multicultural  
Democracy.***

By Stephen Macedo. Harvard Univ. Press. 343 pp. \$45

Macedo believes that America's recent emphasis on diversity, especially in education policy and the law, does not go far enough toward promoting the shared beliefs and virtues needed to sustain a liberal democratic order. He proposes instead "civic liberalism," a "tough-minded" liberalism with "spine." A professor of political science at Princeton University, Macedo has written a blunt, provocative book that significantly clarifies important issues but is unlikely to foster the thoroughgoing civic agreement he seeks.

Liberal democracy, Macedo insists, is not and cannot be a neutral arena, equally hospitable to all ways of life. Rather, it must employ its formative powers to produce citizens deeply committed to liberal democratic principles and institutions. In particular, liberal public education must challenge the particularist views of parents and insular communities in the name of forming good liberal citizens. At the same time, civic liberalism must avoid becoming what Macedo calls "civic totalitarianism," the kind of comprehensive vision of a democratic order (John Dewey's, for example) that runs roughshod over all particular attachments in the name of science, progress, or national unity.

In the abstract, it is hard to disagree with Macedo's case. Like every other form of political regime, liberal democracy rests on certain moral propositions. The artful arrangement of public institutions—divided powers, checks and balances, federalism—is necessary but not sufficient. Liberal democratic citizens must also have a core of shared beliefs and traits of character. Not all ways of life will be equally conducive to liberal democracy, and some

pose such grave challenges that they must be directly confronted. Respect for the free exercise of religion, for example, does not encompass human sacrifice.

In moving from the general to the particular, the difficulties with Macedo's thesis emerge. To begin with, "liberal democracy" names a family of conceptions, not a single uncontested view. For example, Macedo regards participation in public life as an end in itself; other liberals disagree. So certain kinds of liberals could embrace schools that Macedo deems defective.

Second, liberals can agree on the ends of education while disagreeing on the means. Macedo describes the common school "ideal" as an institution that contains society's diversity in a context of tolerance and mutual respect. Unfortunately, relatively few public schools qualify. In many urban areas, in fact, the Catholic schools are more "common" than the public schools. Macedo offers almost no evidence that students attending sectarian schools emerge less tolerant or as inferior citizens overall.

Third, it is possible for liberals to disagree about the priority that should be attached to different components of their creed. While Macedo regards the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 as a "disaster," for example, other liberals saw it as safeguarding

the central place that religious freedom occupies in liberal morality and constitutionalism.

Finally, many liberals believe that liberalism's public principles need not govern the totality of one's private life. Despite his critique of civic totalitarianism, Macedo's brand of liberalism comes close to effacing the public-private distinction. He speaks repeatedly of civic liberalism's "transformative aims," by which he means (among other things) reshaping civil associations and even religious institutions to be consonant with liberal public principles. At one point he says that "liberal citizens should be committed to honoring the public demands of liberal justice in all departments of their lives," from which it would seem to follow that American Catholics are obligated to apply public laws against gender discrimination to the recruitment of their priests.

When public norms and religious commitments come into conflict, which should prevail? Macedo's brand of liberalism accords "supreme importance" to maintaining political institutions. Other, no less authentic understandings see freedom of religious expression as a liberal end to which liberal institutions are simply means. No verbal formula can dissolve the tension between basic liberties and the requirements of the institutions that protect them.

—William A. Galston

## Science & Technology

### OF TWO MINDS: *The Growing Disorder in American Psychiatry.*

By T. M. Luhrmann. Knopf. 352 pp.  
\$26.95

In *Structural Anthropology* (1963), Claude Lévi-Strauss retells the story, collected by Franz Boas, of the sorcerer Quesalid, a Kwakiutl Indian of Vancouver, Canada. Quesalid is a skeptic who studies with shamans in order to expose their tricks. Their darkest secret involves a tuft of down which the shaman hides in his cheek and, at the crucial moment, spits out, covered with blood—false evidence of illness sucked from an afflicted body. But Quesalid finds himself trapped: As an apprentice shaman, he cures patients with such success that he cannot cast off his calling. His attitude

changes. He comes to value conscientiousness and forget his initial doubts. The signs of the true shaman, he declares, are that "he does not allow those who are made well to pay him" and that he never laughs.

Each year, I assign this passage to beginning psychiatry trainees. It speaks not only to their cynicism, but to their growing sense of competence as they enter a fellowship whose methods are vulnerable to attack and yet demonstrably effective.

*Of Two Minds* examines how psychiatric residents become acculturated in this fellowship. Luhrmann, an anthropology professor at the University of California, San Diego, calls her method ethnography, but she writes like a journalist who has dived into psychiatric training. The result is a reasoned and reasonable