The Journal of Religion

argues that the fact that most ethical discussion in the public square is secularized (“not ‘framed by a theological perspective’ is taken for granted by all those who participate in it”) “is not a reflection of commitment to secularism,” that is, an ideology that competes with religious traditions for ultimate commitment (93). In other words, a separationist interpretation of the religion clauses does not necessarily presuppose an ideology of secularism (e.g., comprehensive liberalism). Stout emphasizes that a secularized modern democratic discourse does not “involve endorsement of the ‘secular state’ as a realm entirely insulated from the effects of religions convictions, let alone removed from God’s ultimate authority. It is simply a matter of what can be presupposed in a discussion with other people who happen to have different theological commitments and interpretive dispositions” (Stout, 97). Consequently, Hitchcock’s critique of comprehensive liberalism as a “secular orthodoxy” does not rule out the possibility of a republic with a secularized public square that recognizes and encourages citizens holding a plurality of religious commitments and that is consistent with a separationist interpretation (or some other interpretation) of the religion clauses.

In addition, Hitchcock’s argument fails to present persuasive reasons why we should revert back to the framers’ interpretation of the religion clauses and their Christian understanding of the republic. Even if we grant his historical argument, Hitchcock fails to provide an argument for why the “original intent” of the framers should be the controlling interpretative approach. The Constitution does not include interpretative rules requiring that it be interpreted according to the text and the framers’ intent. Interpreters must choose whether to rely on the framers’ intent, the text of the Constitution, Supreme Court precedent, prudential consequences, ethical concerns, natural law principles, or some combination of these factors. In fact, his emphasis on the framers’ intent suggests a formalistic legal positivism (the meaning of the religion clauses is a determinate fact) that would substantially exclude the natural law principles he claims are part of the moral basis of American democracy.

Despite these concerns, both volumes make an important contribution to the historical understanding of religious liberty in America. They reveal an alternative reading of the framers’ understanding of the religion clauses and of the role of religion in public life. Hitchcock also persuasively establishes that legal issues beyond the religion clauses (e.g., church property, religiously affiliated institutions, and internal church disputes) are central to understanding religious liberty in America.

MARK C. MODAK-TRURAN, *Mississippi College, School of Law.*

HEINZE, ANDREW R. *Jews and the American Soul: Human Nature in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004. xvi+438 pp. \$29.95 (cloth).

In *Jews and the American Soul*, Andrew Heinze considers the influence of Jewish figures, both intellectual and popular, on the formation of American attitudes toward the psyche. Assuming a historical perspective reaching from the late nineteenth century to the turn of the millennium, he traces the Jewish contributions to the concept of the psyche and popular understandings of psychoanalysis.

By positing a coherent set of “Jewish values” held by both secular and reli-

Book Reviews

gious Jews, Heinze is able to track the Jewish role in the American public conversation about the human psyche. These values and attitudes, which Heinze explores with nuance throughout the book, are a set of moral beliefs and arguments distinct from their Christian counterparts. Culling evidence from psychoanalytic texts, television and radio programs, popular books, and a host of other sources, Heinze traces the permeation of both “relatedness” and individual identity in the face of opposition as cornerstones of the moral systems of influential Jews, from early European psychoanalysts and American professors to advice columnists. He offers a convincing case that despite differences in professional discipline, religious observance, and birthplace, these Jewish intellectuals and popular figures held a remarkably similar set of moral stances when it came to defining and prescribing norms for the psyche. As Heinze demonstrates the coherence of these values, he argues quite convincingly that Jewish psychoanalysts, psychologists, rabbis, journalists, and writers have imparted an unmistakably Jewish component to mainstream American understandings of the psyche.

Heinze brings significant skill to the project of accounting for many different avenues of the transmission of thought. His attention to transatlantic exchange of ideas alone, not to mention his sensitivity to the cultural differences of his multinational characters, makes *Jews and the American Soul* an impressive work. From Freud, Adler, and their students to Betty Friedan and Rabbi Harold Kushner, Heinze is careful to situate each influential character in his or her own sociohistorical context. Despite its concentration on intellectual history, the book is particularly successful in providing a solid grounding in the cultural milieu of immigrants and the middle class. Moreover, in his attention to psychoanalysis, a subject which demands attention to gender, Heinze gracefully integrates discussion of men, women, and gender roles into his larger study.

Although Heinze draws from a wealth of interesting material, at times the book has the feel of a collection of internally cohesive, well-crafted essays hastily tied together. The somewhat jarring jump from Joyce Brothers as the topic of one chapter to the Holocaust and Hasidism as the next is typical, and Heinze also strays significantly from his argument at times. For instance, although fascinating, Heinze’s chapter concerning the 1808 borrowing of elements of Benjamin Franklin’s *Autobiography* by a Polish Jew falls outside of the scope of his arguments both logically and chronologically.

The achievements that set *Jews and the American Soul* apart from others in its field—or, to be more precise, fields—are numerous. Heinze adds a distinctive Jewish dimension to a previously Protestant-dominated narrative of the development of American views toward the psyche. To the field of the history of psychoanalysis he contributes insight into the differences between Jewish and non-Jewish thinkers. Any author who can deftly combine Sigmund Freud, Rabbi Joshua Liebman Loth, and Ann Landers to produce new insight into American history and culture has obviously written something new and worth reading.

SARAH IMHOFF, *Chicago, Illinois*.

MARTY, MARTIN E. *When Faiths Collide*. Blackwell Manifestos. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2005. 193 pp. \$57.95 (cloth); \$16.95 (paper).

Martin Marty’s new book can be read as the anti-Huntington. In contrast to Samuel Huntington’s fears about the clash of civilizations, Marty believes that