

they deserve. These criticisms should make every conservative think more carefully about his conservatism.

As an academic, I would have liked footnotes or some form of citation. I wanted to read some of the passages cited, not in order to verify, but to get greater information. The book also lacks a bibliography. It is likely that these features, commonly found in academic books, were not included because a broader audience was intended.

These shortcomings are minor inconveniences compared with the overall quality and thoughtfulness of this book that challenges one to think about human sinfulness in the world. Most significantly, the recognition that we are fallen creatures reminds us of the need for eternal salvation, and realizing this need makes us understand that politics has limited ends.

-Michael Coulter  
*Grove City College*

**Craycraft, Kenneth R. *The American Myth of Religious Freedom*. Dallas: Spence Publishing, 1999. 226 pp. \$27.95 hardcover.**

Some books advance our understanding by discovering new information or by bringing to our attention the thought of a long-neglected thinker. Others do so by taking "old" thoughts or information and either asking new questions or arranging the information in a way that compels us to see the old in a new light. Kenneth Craycraft's *The American Myth of Religious Freedom* falls in the latter category. All of the writings Craycraft examines--Locke's *Letter on Toleration*, Jefferson's "Statute on Religious Freedom", Madison's "Memorial and Remonstrance", John Courtney Murray's *We Hold These Truths*, and the Second Vatican Council's "Declaration on Religious Freedom"--are familiar to scholars, as is the "story" they tell. This story can be summarized as follows: After centuries in which religious freedom was but a dream, a handful of liberal thinkers began to lay the intellectual foundations for a theory of religious freedom. Taking their bearings primarily from Locke, Jefferson and Madison both improved upon the theory, for example, by granting religious freedom to Catholics as well as Protestants, and then implemented it, first in the state of Virginia and then, through the First Amendment, in the rest of the country. On the Catholic side, Murray's importance is measured, first, by his success in convincing his co-religionists to drop their hostility to religious freedom and, second, as one of the thinkers who shaped Vatican Council II's Declaration on Religious Freedom (hereinafter: Declaration), which essentially "baptized" the First Amendment.

Craycraft's work is both interesting and helpful because he challenges much of this story as well as the assumptions which provide its foundation. Put simply, Craycraft argues first, that the liberal understanding of religious freedom as presented in the writings of Locke, Jefferson, and Madison, and enthusiastically adopted by much of the Supreme Court, does not serve to "protect religious freedom in its full and authentic sense." Second, he contends that the Declaration's understanding of religious freedom should not be regarded as simply accepting the First Amendment, but instead as a critique of and alternative to the First Amendment.

To make his first argument, Craycraft considers three commonly expressed opinions about the relationship between religion and politics. The first is that the founders intended to construct a regime which provided for the greatest possible respect of and freedom for Christianity. The second is that the founders' intention was to create a wholly secular government devoted to wholly secular purposes. The third, which is expressed by Christians across the political and religious spectrum, is that Christians are best served by living in a regime such as ours.

Craycraft contends that much of the above is simply a myth. The founders, and especially Madison and Jefferson, did not wish to grant the highest possible respect to and freedom for Christianity, but instead hoped to privatize it and thus dramatically limit its influence upon the state. Put more sharply, Craycraft argues that the founders' intention was not to separate church and state, but to subsume the church under the state. Next, Craycraft argues that the American understanding of religious freedom is not and, in fact, cannot be a perfectly fair and neutral solution to the theological-political problem. By understanding religion as a wholly private affair, the First Amendment positively favors those who say, with Jefferson, that the belief in no god or twenty gods is politically irrelevant and disfavors those who disagree. Because of this, Craycraft wonders why Christians (or at least those Christians whom he refers to as "traditional" or "orthodox" Christians) should regard a system which not only encourages but favors religious indifference as the best of all possible worlds.

Craycraft's argument is fairly persuasive. He convincingly demonstrates that Madison and Jefferson (following Locke) attempted to discourage orthodox Christians from bringing their perspectives to bear on public issues. Likewise, he presents a sound argument that the First Amendment does not embody a neutral or fair position towards all religions. And finally, Craycraft is correct in arguing that Christians should not be so quick uncritically to accept the First Amendment's understanding of religion. After all, if religion is a private affair, doesn't that necessarily imply that evangelization is to be discouraged, if not by law at least by social pressure?

I am not certain, however, that Craycraft's argument will convince his readers, especially those who consider themselves politically conservative

Christians. There are two reasons for this. First, they would take issue with his identification of the Founders' intentions with those of Jefferson and Madison, pointing out that the First Amendment was not exclusively their product, but rather an effort which included at least some who were much more sympathetic to the claims of traditional Christianity. With the exception of a brief analysis of Washington's Farewell Address, Craycraft does not take these other perspectives into account. Second, politically conservative Christians might argue that the Supreme Court violated the founders' intentions in an egregious manner by applying the religion clause to the states. That is, while at least some of the founders may have wished to cleanse the public square of Christianity, all agreed that the issue should be a matter for the states, not the federal government. Since Craycraft wishes to argue that the Court's hostility towards religion is not a rejection but an affirmation of the founders' intent, these are not minor objections. In this regard, I think a potentially interesting project would be a critical examination of the thought of those who are deemed to be more friendly to religion, such as Washington, Adams, and the anti-Federalists.

Turning to the Church, Craycraft argues that her teaching on religious freedom differs on two counts from that embodied by the First Amendment. First, the Declaration begins with the contention that all have a duty to seek the truth and to order their lives to it. Thus the Church claims not only that each person must live by the light of conscience, but also adds, unlike Locke, Madison and Jefferson, that each person must take care to properly form his or her conscience. Second, and again in contrast to the above mentioned thinkers, the Declaration does not limit itself to mentioning the rights of the individual, but also declares that the Church possesses certain rights.

By drawing our attention to these differences, Craycraft nicely illustrates the distance between the Catholic and liberal understanding of religious freedom. Moreover, he provides a useful hermeneutic for understanding why the Church's attempts to exercise her rights often bring about a firestorm of criticism. (See, for example, the reaction to Cardinal O'Connor's admonition to "pro-choice" politicians.) Because liberalism recognizes only individual rights, any attempt by the Church to exercise her rights and responsibilities as a teacher strike many as an effort to effectively deny individual religious freedom. "Who," asks the secular press, "is the Church to tell her members how to act?" Of course, if the Church cannot or should not attempt to publicly teach her charges, then one might reasonably wonder how free the Church is. Finally, by emphasizing the distinctiveness of the Declaration, Craycraft reminds us of the question we should be asking. To paraphrase Fr. Murray, the question is not how can the Catholic understanding of religion be made more compatible with America, but how can America be brought to accept the teaching of the Declaration?

In conclusion, Kenneth Craycraft has written a lively and thoughtful book. There is, of course, much more which needs to be done, but this is a solid contribution to the debate and can be read with profit by both scholars and ordinary citizens.

-Robert J. Phillips  
*Wheeling Jesuit University*

**Day, Dorothy. *On Pilgrimage*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1999. 256pp. \$16.95 paperback.**

If you are only going to read one book by or about Dorothy Day, read this book. Dorothy Day, the cofounder (along with the Franco-American philosopher Peter Maurin) of the Catholic Worker movement, has been called "a living basilica" by Cardinal John O'Connor. Although she led a disordered life before her conversion to Catholicism, she quickly gained the heart and mind of the Church. Day was recently voted the "most outstanding lay Catholic in the world during the twentieth century" by a panel of Catholic scholars and philosophers.

*On Pilgrimage* is the seventh volume in the prestigious *Ressourcement: Retrieval & Renewal in Catholic Thought* series organized by David Schindler. Other authors in the series include Cardinal Ratzinger, Angelo Scola, Henri de Lubac and George Bernanos. If you are wondering if Dorothy Day belongs in such rarified company, reading this book will dispel all doubts. After a brief forward, there is a valuable introduction to Day and the Catholic Worker movement by Mark and Louise Zwick. They helpfully dispel various myths about Day and appropriately emphasize her robust orthodoxy. This is necessary as many persons active in the Catholic Worker movement today fail to evidence Day's fidelity to the whole of the Catholic faith.

The main body of the book is a collection of short essays Day penned throughout 1948. The first three months of entries were composed during Day's visit with her daughter's family in West Virginia. They offer poignant descriptions of (and reflections on) the rural homesteading experience and Catholic family life that surrounded Day during this time. The visit provided a context for numerous reflections by Day on the differences between men and women and the nature and value of housework. Day is decidedly traditional when it comes to family life, and some of her statements will surely ruffle a few feathers among feminists. At one point she states, "so many mothers run away from their children or put them in nurseries or go out to work because they can't stand the 'pruning,' the cutting, the suffering that such love entails" (206).