

long to the irrational. In the pre-Enlightenment world, the pope relates, reason emanated from the questioning model established by Socrates, and it was possible to confront issues in ethics, just as Manuel II did over the relative merits of Christianity and Islam. "To convince a reasonable soul," the emperor asserts, "one does not need a strong arm, or weapons of any kind." Reason will yield the answer as to which faith is the truer one.

The pope's larger point is precisely that reason has strayed so far from its roots that it has lost the ability to render such judgments. It is profoundly significant to the pope that the Greek word *logos* means both "reason" and "word"—as in "In the beginning was the Word . . ."—and that this conjunction forms, in the pope's view, "an encounter between genuine enlightenment and religion. From the very heart of Christian faith . . . Manuel II was able to say: Not to act 'with logos' is contrary to God's nature."

The pope recognizes that this same conjunction of Greek thought and religious faith that led

to the Enlightenment in the West also spawned philosophers such as Immanuel Kant (*Critique of Pure Reason*, 1781). Under Kant's withering gaze, Harris writes, "all religious faiths are equally irrational, all systems of ethics equally unverifiable." The pope finds this state of affairs not only unacceptable but even "dangerous . . . for humanity." He has no desire to reject modernity, but asks, "Can modern reason really stand on the sidelines of a clash between a religion that commands jihad and a religion that forbids violent conversion?"

## RELIGION &amp; PHILOSOPHY

## No Consensus on Census

**THE SOURCE:** "Religion as Identity in Post-war America: The Last Serious Attempt to Put a Question on Religion in the United States Census" by Kevin M. Schultz, in *The Journal of American History*, Sept. 2006.

IN TRADITIONAL HISTORIES of the 1950s, religion united Americans in a way of life that

contrasted with that of their godless Soviet counterparts across the Cold War divide. Not so, writes historian Kevin M. Schultz, a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture at the University of Virginia. In 1956 and '57, deep rifts among American Catholics, Protestants, and Jews became evident in a fierce debate sparked by something no less mundane than the U.S. Census. On a 1956 list of official considerations for the 1960 census, one question topped them all: Should the census for the first time gather data on religious affiliation?

Catholics came out in strong support. Knowing where their parishioners resided would enable them to better locate hospitals and parochial schools. Less overtly, many Catholics hoped that statistical proof of their numbers would enhance their political power. Protestants largely steered clear of the debate, realizing that the data would probably affect them little.

The Jewish community, however, raged in opposition. Publicly, Jewish leaders built their

## EXCERPT

## One Nation, Under Four Gods

*America, it turns out, is not one nation under one God. We answer, in actuality, to four Gods. . . . The most popular God, backed by 31 percent, is an "authoritarian" father figure who takes a very hands-on approach to his domain. He rewards the faithful and smites the sinful. Another 23 percent envision God as essentially "benevo-*

*lent"—a loving spirit who provides help and guidance when asked. For 16 percent, God presides over the universe like a taciturn judge, . . . tallying up sins and virtues, and rendering a verdict when people die. Finally, 24 percent see God as a mysterious prime mover who engineered the Big Bang and evolution, . . . then backed off to watch how it would all come out.*

*These differing conceptions of God, [a new survey by Gallup for Baylor University] found, are ultimately more important to people's political and social views than their party registrations or church affiliations.*

—WILLIAM FALK, editor in chief, in *The Week* (Oct. 6, 2006)

argument upon the great bedrock of constitutional law—the separation of church and state—while they acknowledged quietly that their opposition sprang from the concerns that such statistics could be misused. With the horrors of the Holocaust never too far from memory, Jews feared that correlating wealth and education with religion would feed latent anti-Semitism in the American public. One commentator wrote that such information “might become the entering wedge for the kind of secret government files . . . that were detested features of the Nazi and Fascist regimes.”

By late November 1957, Robert W. Burgess, director of the Bureau of the Census, realized that he

## EXCERPT

## Pious Stress

*The anguish of the believer striving for inner obedience will be clear to anyone who has been immersed in the evangelical world. There is a kind of correlation between all the promises of peace, the assertions of joy, and the reality of inner turmoil. . . . When every thought, and not just every action, must be obedient to Christ, and faith is fidelity to what you cannot actually sense, the result is a formula for zeal, to be sure, but also for pious stress, and even breakdown.”*

—TODD SHY, Raleigh, N.C., writer and self-described recovering evangelical, in *Image* (Fall 2006)

could no longer let the debate fester; he risked stirring opposition to the entire census and losing respondents en masse. Upon the removal of the question from formal consideration, the American Jewish community proclaimed “a

victory for religious liberty.” The success, due in no small part to a letter-writing campaign aimed at congressional representatives, demonstrated Jews’ influence in political life.

The Census Bureau had conducted two trial surveys of the religion question. The answers had been as expected. Two of every three people over age 14 regarded themselves as Protestant, one of four as Roman Catholic, and about three of 100 as Jewish. But the full report was never

released. The Commerce Department, in consultation with the White House, said it was “not feasible” to release statistics of such nature. It was an enduring result: To this day, the census has never included a question about religion.

## SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY

## Smoking Your Money's Worth

**THE SOURCE:** “Taxes, Cigarette Consumption, and Smoking Intensity” by Jérôme Adda and Francesca Cornaglia, in *The American Economic Review*, Sept. 2006.

BOOSTING TAXES ON CIGARETTES may be hurting the health of those it doesn’t drive to quit, researchers at University College London have found. That’s because

smokers, especially the poor, react to the higher cost of cigarettes by smoking each cigarette more intensively. They take more puffs, inhale more deeply, smoke closer to the end, and block the ventilation holes on the filter.

Several studies since 2000 have found that as taxes rise, cigarette

consumption goes down. But economists Jérôme Adda and Francesca Cornaglia write that many adult smokers are compensating by extracting far more nicotine from each cigarette. They studied levels of cotinine, a byproduct of nicotine, in 20,000 Americans who participated in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey from 1988 to 1994 and 1999 to 2000. Their surprising finding: A one percent rise in taxes increased smoking intensity by 0.47 percent. And more intensive smoking is especially unhealthy. “Smoking a cigarette