

- 
- 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