owens: You begin your book by saying that the question of whether reltflfl

of latent or tacit the ological dimension to them. $\;$ There's an enormous body of literature on these matters that—as far as I can tell—hardly anyone in this debate has actually paid much attention to at all. There are fantastic historians, such as Mark Noll, particularly his book America's God; there are many fantastic sociologists on this, most notably Robert Wuthnow, whose The Restructuring of American Religion really needs to be given more attention by philosophers and theologians than it has yet received. He points out, for example, that up through the 1940s, most social services in the

 $United States were run through chntad] (n) 1.6(g) ougds \ t.6(g) oug 37 (nred S) 17. (60) -8(w) -4.1(ho) -1w(i) 10.6(te). 4(f)] d S 3n \ ma. 8(o) 9(n316 (t) -22(.6)) d theelta (ta) -16.4 tulucs .8(eve i) -141. (5) -83. (5.3(n t) -y431. (5n)] TJge)] TJT (U) 20. ft 1(v) -31(i) 3. (5n) 4r. (5n) 7.6(e(s t.6(3.62e) -11. (6) 316.2(n) 4.9(l) 3. (5-27.2(i) 9.6) (t) 10.2 (t)$

This tradition takes the Greek and Roman thinkers as crucial, but also has as central figures Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Montesquieu, the American Founders, perhaps especially Madison, Constant, Tocqueville, in a way Mill, Arendt—it's a list of people who were, again, with some exceptions left o of my graduate school reading lists. And what a shame.

I take it that the tradition of civic republicanism is in some aspects a very attractive vernacular within which to think about Christian engagement with politics. But as I also say in the book, the civic republican tradition presents some real challenges to Christian political thought. You can't just simply fit it into a

 $t\ n\ v20.7.1(n\ p(a)1)-\textbf{(a)}16(h)-16.2i4(a)6-(n\ t)-)]T\ 6.2(0.3(u796.2().8(s)-\textbf{(2)}(6.6(e\)]T(7(h)e\ 6.6t)-)]T\ 6.2(\textbf{(3)}1)4o387.3t)6(.6o1n\ v.\textbf{(5}o)9)]9(cT[\textbf{(t)}-31.\textbf{(h)}7o-7.5t)14[(17n\ \textbf{(5)}4(e\ t(a))590.-27.2(m)(6.71,obn\ 2(t\ i)6.6(e\)]T(7(h)e\ w()1\textbf{(3)}(-3\textbf{(6)}y)\textbf{(5)}(d(t\ t)-)]T\ h))-10.4(a)7)-,IdT\ h6d.8(s)-\textbf{(2)}(n\ 6.2(0.3(t6f)h)71()o3(u7(g)4(\textbf{(5)}1)(10.2(t3)(1$

with some other thinkers, economists and psychologists, on the political e ects of information polarization. That is, on the political e ects of what happens when people don't have access to competing views. And of course that's quite devastating for the polity, for people's ability to understand what's going on in their world, and also to understand the range

```
T. e B Ce e f
Re. a d A e ca
P. b. c L fe
B C.. e e
24 Q. c. R ad
C. e H.., MA 02467

e. 617-552-1860
fa 617-552-1863
b. fe@bc.ed.

b ce e
```