

Chapter 1 : forman | Faculty & Staff Directory

Enlightenment, University of Toronto Press, , Larry Wolff, ^Discovering ultural Perspective: The Intellectual History of Anthropological Thought in the Age of Enlightenment in The Anthropology of the Enlightenment,

Peter Berger, professor emeritus of religion, sociology and theology at Boston University, examined the globalization of religious pluralism and how the peaceful coexistence of different racial, ethnic and religious groups has become a global phenomenon. He argues that pluralism "not secularization" and the resulting emergence of religious choice is the best model for understanding religion in a globalizing world. A question-and-answer session followed his presentation. Professor Berger has written dozens of books. *Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* is one of the best books on the sociological theory of religion. He has written about theology. One of those is called *A Far Glory*: He has also written on economics, international relief and development. He wrote a book called *A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural*. His book on capitalism, called *The Capitalist Revolution*, is a tour de force. Thank you, Peter, for coming. Coming down here from Boston I realized I could be in Istanbul if it were a direct flight. But before that, I was in Los Angeles about five weeks ago, and three weeks ago I was in Europe, and both had to do with religious globalization. In Los Angeles, the Templeton Foundation ran a very successful conference on global pentecostalism, which was fascinating, and it was to commemorate the th anniversary of the Azusa Street Mission, which was the origin of modern pentecostalism. There were very good papers, and we saw a little movie about the Azusa Street Mission, which was a pathetic little affair where this charismatic black preacher came out of Texas and started preaching. Estimates of the number of followers vary, I guess Pew has the latest. But in terms of worldwide pentecostalism, the estimates range within million and million adherents, which must be the fastest growth of any religious movement in history. My first stop in Europe was Amsterdam. A friend of mine " a Dutch sociologist " is chairman of the advisory committee to the new Islamic University in Rotterdam, which is a very interesting institution. Just a little factoid: I think there is no major world religion that is not globalizing in an impressive way. The Roman Catholic Church actually could be called the oldest global institution, and certainly is continuing this today, although it is very much changing its character. The geographical and demographic center of Christianity is moving from north to south, and within a very few years European and North American Catholics, and Christians of any sort, will be in the minority in the world. So for example, the Mormons, who most people would not consider exactly Protestant, still are very similar to this broad family of religious groups in terms of social characteristics. Mormonism today is probably the fastest growing denomination worldwide " pentecostalism is not just one denomination. Buddhism is spreading in the oddest places; the estimate now is that about , Americans are converts to Buddhism from other religions. Hinduism is spreading through a number of organizations like the Hare Krishna movement, the Sai Baba movement in a very interesting way. I suppose that of the major world religions, the only one that does not globalize is Shinto: Even Confucianism, if you want to call it a religion, is globalizing and for a short and rather inglorious period, it became the state ideology of Singapore. Let me present my major thesis this morning, which is what I want to talk about. My thesis is that what is happening with the globalization of religion is a globalization of pluralism. Pluralism, which was a much more geographically, much more limited phenomenon or years ago, has become a global phenomenon, and that has enormous implications, and I want to just draw out these implications this morning. The term, as far as I know, was coined by Horace Kallen, an American philosopher of the s, whom I think has justly been forgotten. I once tried to read Kallen and I found him unreadable, but he used the term pluralism in a very normative sense, in a way to celebrate the peaceful coexistence of different ethnic, racial and religious groups in the United States. Pluralism in the meantime is used in a less value-laden sense to mean simply the fact. Well, you can use it without the good thing addition, simply as a value-free description of a situation. That, I think, is very important. I recently was on a panel with a very good Turkish sociologist and I talked about pluralism " modern pluralism. She said, well, pluralism existed in the Ottoman Empire, the millet system where you had Christians and Jews and various groups being sort of self-contained and given certain rights;

that was pluralism. Or India for example: Many Hindus are very proud of the fact that India has always been pluralistic. The interaction is important in my concept of pluralism because as people talk to each other, as they converse with each other, they influence each other, and that is the real challenge of pluralism. There have been pluralistic situations as I defined pluralism in earlier periods of history – very important for the history of Western civilization. The late Roman Empire was pluralistic. Not so incidentally, Christianity came in at that period. Or in the Book of Acts when the Apostle Paul went to Athens, he found temples and altars to every conceivable god. So that was very pluralistic, and if you look at the literature from that period, it strikes us as very modern. Stay with the example of Alexandria, if you went up the Nile for 50, 60 miles, I think you would come on a world of villagers and towns which were totally non-pluralistic, which were very self-contained. Today it is extremely difficult to find places in the world, which are self-contained in that way. And also the speed with which pluralization occurs today is unique. Now, I would also argue that in terms of the effect on religion, pluralism is about the most important global fact to look at – not secularization. Until quite recently, most scholars who dealt with religion in the modern world adhered to the so-called secularization theory. So did I, by the way, when I started work as a sociologist of religion. And I was not alone: Most people had the same idea. The idea was very simple: Modernization means a decline in religion. And I would say this was not a crazy idea, there were some reasons for saying that. I think it was wrong. And I, along with most people in the field, changed my mind about 25 or so years ago, not for some philosophical or theological reason, but simply because the empirical evidence made it impossible to adhere to this theory. There are few people who heroically maintain the theory. The most prominent one died recently: He maintained this to the end, and so do some other people. But most scholars of religion today, I think, would agree that secularization theory has been massively falsified. The sociological exception is, there is a relatively thin, but very influential stratum of people internationally; broadly speaking an intelligentsia who indeed is secular. In many countries including the United States, this intelligentsia or cultural elite, if you want to use another term, is very much in conflict with the religious populace. It is a very important fact in many countries. Why are these people so secularized? The other is the geographical exception, which to my mind is the most interesting question today in the sociology of religion. Very interesting place not very far from here is Quebec, which rapidly secularized itself in recent decades. People who have to deal with sociology of religion have to deal with Iranian mullahs – people like that. Well, the Iranian mullahs have been around for a long time, we know how they work basically and why. And those are the really interesting subjects. Okay, back to pluralism. One reason why secularization theory just collapses under its own weight is the United States, a strongly religious country, and if modernity is the key variable, are you going to seriously argue that the United States is less modern than Stockholm? While secularity is not a necessary consequence of modernization, I would argue that pluralism is. And the reason has to do with some very basic processes of modernity: What does it mean? What does globalizing communication mean? Everybody talks to everybody else, and as everyone talks to everybody else, a highly pluralistic situation is enhanced by technology and people begin to influence each other. When my granddaughter was about six, the people across the street were missionaries for Jews for Jesus, and the two little girls had theological conversations with each other that were absolutely fascinating. I would say inter-religious communication by 5-year-old, 6-year-old little girls is sociologically more significant than interfaith committees set up by the Vatican – laughter – because there are many more little girls than there are theology professors or whatever. Now, what does that mean for religion? It means that both institutionally and individually, any particular religious tradition can no longer be taken for granted. And this has immense implications for the religious institutions and for individual human beings. You were born into a particular situation and that accidental birth determined almost everything you did, including your beliefs. Modernity means choices, beginning with many choices in terms of technology, I mean, your tribe used one hammer for a particular task for hundreds of years. Now instead of one hammer, you have three technological systems. And there are choices in terms of consumption, production, marriage, occupation and in a sense most dramatically, even identity. This movement from fate to choice affects not only individuals but also institutions. I would say in the pluralistic situation whether religious institutions like this or not, they become de facto voluntary associations. The prototypical modern, institutional form of

religion is the voluntary association. Obviously this voluntariness is enhanced when you have a political and legal system, which guarantees religious freedom. And you have all kinds of things springing up, which I think Michael knows much more about this than I do, but which the authorities do not like and cannot control. Richard Niebuhr, a church historian â€” not to be confused with his brother Reinhold â€” said that denomination was a new form of religious institution peculiar to the United States. And he defined it not as a sect, but a church which recognizes de facto, if not de jure, the right of other denominations that do exist. So you can speak of a denominationalization of religion. And take the Roman Catholic Church as a very important example.

Chapter 2 : Religion in a Globalizing World | Pew Research Center

Dialectic of Enlightenment is an important book for students of philosophy, theology, and the social sciences. It invites them to a renewed criticism of the mythological traits and self-destructive tendencies of modern reason.

Dean Dettloff by Dean Dettloff Liberalism is a notoriously sticky term. It attempts to encompass a diverse tradition, full of modifications, nuances, and variety, but to get a handle on it as a useful concept we might note that its roots are in the work of John Locke, who championed the freedom of the individual and famously delineated a triumvirate of natural human rights: To ensure the security of these rights and the individual liberties of human beings, liberalism espouses a differentiation between the state and the economy, which, when both are properly limited, should allow particular freedoms to flourish like free speech and wealth to grow. Yet the division between the state and the economy creates a political bind for liberals, setting the terms of political decision-making for most Western societies. On the one hand, liberals leaning to the right suggest the individual freedoms identified by Locke are best expressed and exercised in the competitive environment of the free-market, leading to a disparaging of the role of the state, seeing it as, at best, a necessary evil. On the other hand, liberals leaning to the left suggest the state protects individual freedoms from the abuses and fallout of competition, perhaps best summarized in the creation of the welfare state, but not without preserving a fair field of play for the competition of the market. Though one might lean to the right or left within a liberal paradigm, the paradigm itself is at the very heart of Western societies and values, even sparking the French and American revolutions. As a result, it comes to us as a default political position; whether one is a republican or democrat in the United States, for instance, both positions are committed forms of liberalism. Sphere sovereignty identifies a variety of distinct social domains that all have equal weight and importance as well as accompanying institutions the state, the family, the church, etc. Even the most ardent critics of an uninhibited market, for example, like Lambert Zuidervaart and Bob Goudzwaard, have to spend a lot of time both hedging their claims and wrestling through the legacies of statespersons like Kuyper and legal theorists like Dooyeweerd to articulate a political vision outside of this double-bind while remaining in the reformational tradition. The liberalism of sphere sovereignty, too, can lean right or left, but it remains a liberalism, albeit tinted with its own particular reformational hue. Doug Blomberg aptly demonstrates this in his presidential inaugural address at ICS. Following a critique of capitalist victory laps in a post-Cold War era, he says: This is not to challenge the value of free enterprise, entrepreneurship or the legitimacy of private ownership. We are to use the abilities God has gifted. There are, however, massive problems with unbridled capitalism, just as there are with an unconstrained state, an imperialistic church, even an all consuming family. David Harvey, which advocates precisely the kind of unbridled capitalism Blomberg and many others in the reformational tradition rightly criticize. A contradiction in reformational thinking is revealed here: Those private owners are organized in separate firms that compete with one another for a variety of advantages commodity shares, access to resources, etc. As a result of this competitive relationship, in order to remain viable and victorious, firms have to extort the maximum surplus-value from the producers they employ, which leads to problematic patterns that especially, though not exclusively, affect workers. Competition necessitates a willingness to create and maintain particular advantages, which often cuts across other values we might privately or socially take to be meaningful in themselves. Rather, the basic structure of capitalism simply demands decisions, whether made with regret or not, that allow one firm survivability over another. While stories of workers finding themselves on the wrong side of capitalism are in no short supply, the tension that interests us here is the one between economy and ecology. In measuring success by the value generated through exchange, these competitive dynamics render other values ineffective or inert. Moreover, because contemporary finance capitalism, premised on a logic of debt and credit, leads to a situation in which money begets money, no attention needs to be paid directly to the material resources that enable exchanges to take place in order for value to increase. We are faced with an impasse between an economic situation that allows for limitless growth in a kind of financial perpetual motion and an ecologic situation that only has so much to give—“infinity exhausts finitude. We are faced with an impasse between an economic situation that allows for

limitless growth in a kind of financial perpetual motion and an ecologic situation that only has so much to give. The ensuing political tension is put on display in a variety of failed global summits to address the encroaching threat of climate change, a threat generated and perpetuated by economies dependent on oil. A committed liberal might here say this is simply a botched and ineffective political apparatus. Such a view ignores both the necessary demands that a society premised on competition makes on its participants and the capacity for monetary growth that outstrips the capacity of ecological habitation. In short, the state is unable to effectively reign in capitalist exchange precisely because it is capitalist exchange. The Earth, in fact, would free herself from the cancer that threatens to metastasize throughout the whole organism of Gaia. A lifetime of thinking and acting through unheard revolutions earns such a view, unfortunately. But reformational eschatology, as recently explored by, among others, Olthuis, Zuidervaart, and most systematically Nicholas Ansell, might yet try to offer a word of hope. Such a word is necessary indeed, but it would require a clear analysis of the problems of capitalist exchange to be more than merely a word, more than merely another gesture toward an electric automobile or an imaginary future infinitely deferred, the kind of thing reformational thought has always tried to resist by affirming creation and this-worldly life. For reformational thinkers to be truly concerned about ecology, they need to grapple with the legacy of liberalism and the necessarily, not incidentally, destructive powers of capital. Perhaps we might say the economic sphere entails the simple practice of exchange between human beings, and we might go on to explore models of exchange outside of the circulation of capital, thereby preserving the salient point of sphere sovereignty that reality and human experience are multi-dimensional and analytically separable and encouraging exchange habits that are ecologically affirmative. Even though Kuyperian politics have largely taken capitalism and its guardian of liberalism for granted, it seems to me there is nothing holding reformational thinkers back from affirming the economic dimension of human social experience and for that very reason considering more equitable and just responses to the call to embody economic life. Without identifying the problem as centering on capital, reformational liberalism will be theoretically and practically complicit in the hegemony of global capital and the continued destruction of the earth. It may be, though, that this provides a future for reformational philosophy, both allowing a variety of creative theoretical horizons that remain mostly under-explored and new energies for political change and action, energies that nourished the reformational tradition in the first place. Most importantly, it may be that this contributes to a future for human life and the flourishing of earth itself. As early as , Zuidervaart was writing explicitly on the problem of money in particular, e. *Theories of the Civic Sector*. Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, , Duke University Press, Dean Dettloff is a PhD level Junior Member at the Institute for Christian Studies, where his research focuses on the intersections of media, politics, and religion.

Chapter 3 : dialectic of enlightenment | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

Dialectic of Enlightenment is a thought-provoking introduction to the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno first identified the "dialectic of enlightenment" when fascism was on the rampage in Europe.

I do have a few things I can contribute from my own teaching practice. It is mainly about the United States, with a bit of comparative work from other places, particularly France. A self-critical note is in order as I post this. It would probably need some revisions for a classroom – it looks too much like a graduate seminar, with too many readings, and not enough space for other kinds of work. But in any case, it does have pointers to a wide range of contemporary critical literature, and I thought it might be a starting place for someone. Maybe even for me, one day. How should we understand its many subcultures, its organizational forms, its economies and its ideological functions? The primary empirical focus of this course will be France and the United States. We will talk a lot about methodology, about multiple sources of data, about different forms of intervention. The Idea of a Multiversity. In *The Uses of the University*. The battle for Morningside Heights: The view from white radicalism Situationist International. On the poverty of student life. Students for a Democratic Society. McMillian, John, and Paul Buhle, eds. *The New Left Revisited*. Race, class, and social reproduction Tuesday: Minoritization and national culture Mir, Shabana. *Muslim American Women on Campus: Undergraduate Social Life and Identity*. Korean Americans and the Problem of Segregation. French students and their relation to culture. University of Chicago Press. The increasingly post-national university Tuesday: Neoliberalism and audit technologies Brenneis, Donald. *New Lexicon, Old Language: In Critical Anthropology Today*, edited by G. School of American Research Press. Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. *Audit culture and anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British higher education*. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5 4: Globalizing the university Ross, Andrew. The mental labor problem. *Social Text* 18 2: Assembling flows, managing citizenship. In *Global Assemblages*, edited by S. Evolving disciplinary conflicts Tuesday: The system of disciplines Abbott, Andrew. Administrative reform and the new conflict of the faculties at French universities. Case studies in disciplinary conflict Jennings, Bruce H. *Agriculture and Human Values From Black Power to Black Studies: How a radical social movement became an academic discipline*. Johns Hopkins University Press. The classroom scene Tuesday: Classroom language and power Mertz, Elizabeth. *Journal of Higher Education* 68 2: The scholarly gaze Tuesday Bourdieu, Pierre. The Scholastic Point of View. *Cultural Anthropology* 5 4: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14 3: Standpoint epistemology and critique Adorno, Theodor, and Max Horkheimer. The Concept of Enlightenment. In *Dialectic of Enlightenment: From Social Activism to Academic Discourse*. Campus space and political economy Tuesday Eichhorn, Kate. The university copy district as abject zone. *Public Culture* 18 3: Land and labor in the post-industrial university town: *African Studies Review* 45 2: Does Education Necessarily Mean Enlightenment? Affect and relationships Tuesday: Student experience Sabin, Portia. *Teachers College Record* 7: Stephens, Sara, and Amelia Fay. *Michigan Discussions in Anthropology Anthropology Today* 10 5: The Financialization of Student Life: Five Propositions on Student Debt. The metanarrative industries Tuesday: The ideology of excellence Readings, Bill. *The University In Ruins*. Excellence, leadership, skills, diversity: Published by Eli Thorkelson Eli Thorkelson edits *Academography* and also keeps a research blog at [decasia](http://decasia.com). View all posts by Eli Thorkelson Posted on.

Chapter 4 : Politics of the University in the Global North Syllabus – “Academography

Hegel's dialectic is powerful: the genius of the Enlightenment culture was to internalize it. But if this is the case, how can one possibly call for reinventing the Enlightenment? In today's tumultuous world, Voltaire and the Enlightenment faith in reason appear weak and, indeed, almost simplistically idealistic.

Brad Allenby Friday, June 30, - 5: But we should also aim higher, seeking no less than the regeneration and reinvention of the Enlightenment. The anthropogenic world is many things, but perhaps most importantly it is the culmination of the project of the Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian Eurocentric West. Technologies and intellectual achievement from cultures around the world, from Islam to China to India, were gathered in the West, built into technologies and institutional inventions such as the nation-state and capitalism, and became the platform for the anthropogenic Earth. But while the Enlightenment and the concomitant scientific revolution represented the triumph of rationality and eventually modernity over a predominantly rural reactionary traditionalism, its brilliant colors are fading, predictably so. For the Enlightenment goes forward now not as it finally expressed itself in the guise of technologically sophisticated high modernity, but as it is transcending itself, as the grounds of something new. And it does so because only a self-transcending culture can hope to be a globalizing culture. Thus, the Enlightenment prospered because its strongest critics were internal: Freud destroying the myth of the rational self; Marx destroying simplistic capitalism; Nietzsche destroying metaphysics; Darwin destroying the Bible as literal truth; the postmodernists destroying simplistic rationalism; environmentalism attacking materialism and consumerism. Thus the irony of cultural dominance: But if this is the case, how can one possibly call for reinventing the Enlightenment? And in fact the Enlightenment goes forward now only as it is able to become the ground of something new, as it transcends its European origins. The Eurocentric world evolved into modernity, but modernity, a brittle structure based on the nation-state and defined elites, has in turn fragmented into postmodernity, and a complexity that obsolesces existing intellectual and cultural systems. While one must be open about the dominance of Western eschatologies and values, for that is where we have come from, we must also realize that they carry within them self-transcendence, and embrace that dynamic. What grows from this point will not be the Enlightenment that has been, for that historical stage is past. But the legacy is not just cultural, for the Enlightenment supported the evolution of the anthropogenic Earth, with its "natural" systems that increasingly are encompassed in cognitive networks grounded in human intentionality. To think of the carbon and nitrogen cycles, the biosphere, or the climate system without thinking of human institutions and systems is no longer realistic; they are increasingly elements of human economics, politics and cultures. Indeed, they can be perceived only through the lenses of our cultural constructs and mental models, and more important our technologies. Thus, the original Enlightenment itself shattered against the increasingly complexity of the cognitive systems it enabled, leaving the only ethical route available to us that of internalizing and transcending, not denying or oversimplifying, the complexity we have already wrought. The challenge, then, is to create a new Enlightenment, not one that reflects only a single culture or tradition, but one that embraces multicultural patterns and mutually exclusive but valid ontologies; not one that assumes an increasingly unrealistic static stability, but one that internalizes constant dialog, change, and unpredictable evolution; not one that encourages reactionary fundamentalisms of any stripe, but one that demands authentic individuals and institutions. Such an Enlightenment arises from, but cannot be sought, in the past; it reflects, but must move beyond, obsolete and increasingly dysfunctional ideologies and wistful utopian fantasies. The choice is not, as some would have it, to deny the anthropogenic world that is already here, for that is simply moral cowardice in the face of challenge and complexity. Rather, it is to grow into our responsibilities, and to learn to be rational, ethical and authentic within a contingent and constantly evolving framework. In doing so, we reinvent yet again the vision of the human in a context undreamt of only a few hundred years ago by those who faced their own unknown, and at that time unprecedented, complexity. Perhaps, like them, we can grow ourselves to create a truly authentic world, and in our turn validate our promise as sentient beings.

Chapter 5 : Download Dialectic Of Enlightenment Cultural Memory In The Present PDF â€“ PDF Search E

Dialectic of Enlightenment is a thought-provoking advent to the Frankfurt university of serious concept. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno first pointed out the "dialectic of enlightenment" while fascism used to be at the rampage in Europe.

Chapter 6 : Ebook Dialectic Of Enlightenment as PDF Download Portable Document Format

Readers will see that Dialectic of Enlightenment actually offers a positive conception of enlightenment and a philosophical instance of the use of dialectics. The book is for readers interested in critiques of capitalism and religion, and sports in America, as well as Marxism and Critical Theory.

Chapter 7 : Ground Motive: A Reformational Eco-Socialism?

of the dialectic is one of a progressive movement toward enlightenment, proceeding through sequences of self-reflection as it moves seemingly inexorably via 'aufhebung' (sublation), towards 'absolute Wissen' (absolute knowing).

Chapter 8 : Project MUSE - On Translation in a Global Market

Globalizing the Rainbow Madonna: Old Time Religion in the Present Age Adorno, Theodor and Max Horkheimer () The Dialectic of Enlightenment.

Chapter 9 : Reinventing the Enlightenment | GreenBiz

Dialectic of Enlightenment is a thought-provoking introduction to the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno first identified the dialectic of enlightenment when fascism was on the rampage in Europe.