I. The case against religious influence in politics
   A. Theory
      1. Extreme beliefs concerning truth and righteousness
         a. Close-mindedness
         b. Intolerance
      2. Extreme actions result from extreme beliefs
         a. Rejection of democratic procedural norms – bargaining and compromise
         b. Support for authoritarian & totalitarian policies (e.g., abridgement or denial of fundamental constitutional rights of religious minorities by those in a religious majority)
      3. Both are a widespread problem
         a. 1st world & 3rd world
         b. Christian & non-Christian
   B. Explanations:
      1. Institutional interests (Samuel Stouffer): nonconformity threatens
      2. Social environment (Theodor W. Adorno): limited education, social isolation, parochial lifestyles
      3. Creedal styles of thinking (Milton Rokeach): true-believer close-mindedness
   C. Evidence
      1. Data
         a. Stouffer study
         b. General social survey
      2. Methods
         a. Dependent variable: tolerance of deviants -- support for civil liberties
         b. Independent variables included
            (1) Religiosity
            (2) Religious denomination -- fundamentalist v. modernizing
      3. Findings: political tolerance is a function of
         a. Denominational differences
         b. Religiosity differences
            (1) Amount
            (2) Nature
               (a) Extrinsic attachment: social motives
               (b) Intrinsic attachment: truly devout
               (c) Quest attachment
         c. Political participation
   D. Conclusions
      1. Mixed findings
      2. Methodological shortcomings
         a. Lack of controls
         b. Unrepresentative samples
         c. Measurement problems
            (1) Operationalizing concepts
               (a) Intolerance
               (b) Religiosity
            (2) Abstract attitudes v. concrete behaviors, e.g., Skokie controversy
            (3) Socially-desirable response set problems
            (4) Democratic procedural norms
               (a) Mass mobilization and participation
               (b) Agenda-setting by pluralist group leaders
II. The case for religion in politics
   A. Religious values can support democracy
      1. Absence of faith is more dangerous than excess of passion
      2. Examples
         a. Human rights - political, economic, social
         b. Office holding as a public trust
         c. Cooperation among nations
   B. Religious groups and institutions can support democracy
      1. Fight separation of religious conscience from secular behavior
      2. Protect the individual from authoritarian states
         a. Left-wing authoritarian states: Poland & Nicaragua
         b. Right-wing authoritarian states: El Salvador & Philippines

III. Conclusion: religion can cause good or evil in politics
   A. Cause: ambiguity of religious texts and teachings
   B. Consequence: mixed political messages from religious leaders
      1. Specific policy issues
         a. Slavery
         b. Prohibition
         c. Role of women
         d. Environmental policy
      2. General values
         a. Democratic government
         b. Capitalistic economy
         c. Pluralistic society
   C. Nature of – rather than amount of – religious commitment is more important in shaping political attitudes and beliefs