## PLS 292-02: THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT IN US POLITICS CHAPTER OUTLINE

## ROZELL & WILCOX, CH. 16: CONCLUSION: THE CHRISTIAN RIGHT IN CAMPAIGN '96

- I. 1996 presidential contest
  - A. A disappointment for the CR
    - 1. Bob Dole refused to embrace social issues
    - 2. Bill Clinton won easily
  - B. Evaluations
    - 1. CR: Dole lost because he didn't win support of social conservatives
    - 2. Republican moderates: Dole lost because CR alienated potential swing voters with intolerant platform and campaign rhetoric
      - a. Partisan independents
      - b. Ideological moderates
      - c. Women
      - d. Youth
    - 3. Rozell & Wilcox: Dole lost because
      - a. Clinton stole many Republican issues from them
      - b. Clinton benefitted from peace and prosperity
- II. Taking stock of Christian right successes in the GOP Congress
  - A. Most analysts give partial credit to cultural right for GOP recapture of Congress in 1994
    - 1. Christian right
    - 2. Gun enthusiasts
    - 3. Other cultural groups
  - B. But, "Contract with America" focused on economic rather than social policy goals
  - C. And, the Christian Coalition's "Contract with the American Family"
    - 1. Moderated or made ambiguous their social policy goals
    - 2. Added secular conservative policy goal: taxes, welfare, crime
  - D. But, the new GOP Congress under Gingrich gave only minor, symbolic victories to the Christian right while reserving major, substantive victories for economic and defense conservatives (as had the earlier Reagan administration)
    - 1. Did not override Clinton's veto of partial-birth abortion ban
    - 2. Restrictions on Internet pornography not likely to survive court challenge
    - 3. Providing asylum for victims of forced abortions in other countries
    - 4. Banning use of federal funds for abortions for federal prisoners
  - E. Some Christian-right activists and leaders are therefore highly critical of Republican party's lack of commitment to social conservative goals
    - 1. Former Moral Majority leader Cal Thomas
    - 2. Paul Weyrich, Free Congress Foundation
    - 3. Charles Colson
  - F. New Congress under Hastert may win back CR support with Rep. Ernest Ishtook's proposed Constitutional amendment to allow state-sponsored prayer in public schools
- III. The Christian right in the Republican party
  - A. CR stronger in '96 than in any previous year
    - 1. Won nomination contests in primary states
    - 2. Key player in selection of new GOP party chair that is a movement sympathizer [Jim Nicholson]
  - B. Some moderate leaders appeal to both wings economic & social conservatives
    - 1. George W. Bush (TX)
    - 2. George Allen (VA)
    - 3. Dan Quayle
  - C. But, activist split is large
    - 1. Economic activists complain that CR purists nominate unelectable extremists
    - 2. Social/cultural activists complain that economic activists want only their votes and \$ but deny policy payoffs
  - D. Factional division can be good and bad for party
    - 1. Bad, if carried too far

- 2. Good, if strength party by offering legitimate compromises that provide incremental progress in at least some policy areas to both sides while taking mainly centrist positions for the general electorate
- IV. Purists and pragmatists: divisions within the Christian right
  - A. Pragmatist: Ralph Reed
    - 1. Compromise is essential to succeed in U.S. pluralistic politics
    - 2. Incremental progress is preferable to idealistic defeat
  - B. Purists: James Dobson, Gary Bauer, Bay Buchanan
    - 1. Absolute policy goals
    - 2. Strong condemnations of immoral/sinful behavior
  - C. Factional divisions are common in all social/political movements
    - 1. Civil rights: SCLC v. Black Panthers
    - 2. Gay rights: Act Up v. Human Rights Campaign or Log Cabin Republicans
    - 3. NOW: internal divisions
    - 4. Labor: Debbs v. Gompers
- V. The Christian right in the next millennium: uncertain future
  - A. Accomplished less than labor, civil rights, and feminist movements (1952 Rip Van Winkle and 1996 Republican convention analogy)
  - B. CR has seen some policy reversals
    - 1. More nontraditional roles for women
    - 2. More spousal benefits for partners of gays and lesbians
    - 3. Public attitudes on abortion, gay rights, gender equality, sex education
  - C. But CR has achieved some marginal policymaking successes
    - 1. Abortion
      - a. Waiting periods
      - b. Parental notification
      - c. Federal funding
    - 2. Student religious group meetings in public schools
  - D. Explanation why Republican party has not produced more CR policy initiatives
    - 1. Policy initiatives that seek to achieve equal rights and opportunities for Christians are usually successful
      - a. Labor: right to organize, safe working conditions
      - b. African-Americans: right to vote, access to public accommodations
      - c. Women: right to vote, equal employment opportunities
      - d. CR: right to read Bibles in study hall, offer private prayer before lunch, organize student religious groups; eliminate "marriage tax," homemaker-IRA tax exemptions
    - 2. Policy initiatives that seek to limit the rights and opportunities of those with different moral beliefs are more likely to trigger counter-mobilization
      - a. Banning abortion
      - b. Limiting employment opportunities for mothers outside the home
      - c. Requiring the teaching of creation science and banning the teaching of evolution
      - d. Limiting the rights of gays and lesbians
      - e. Censoring all materials objectionable to the CR
    - 3. Majority becoming more tolerant on many of these issues
      - a. Generational change
      - b. Increase in college-educated
  - E. Likely future: fragmentation
    - 1. Pragmatists: stay in large, mainstream, national organization devoted to incremental change through cooperation and compromise within the Republican party
    - 2. Purists: fragment into a number of smaller, more radical factions
      - a. Some withdrawing from politics completely
      - b. Some splitting off from "normal" politics to pursue ideologically pure, independent candidacies or a third party