

-
- 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