

- I. Are most members and leaders of the Christian Right **socially & psychologically dysfunctional**?
- A. Study of political pathology
1. Origin: explain rise of Nazi regime in German Weimar Republic (T. Adorno, The Auth. Pers. (1959))
 2. More recent focus: intolerance & extremism of both left & right
- B. Causal factors
1. Social pathologies cause psychological pathologies
 - a. Authoritarian child-rearing practices: feelings of inadequacy & self-hatred
 - b. Breakdown of social attachments in mass society: rootlessness, isolation, alienation, anomie
 2. Psychological pathologies:
 - a. Displacement of feelings of inadequacy & self-hatred into
 - (1) Subservience to authority figures: left or right
 - (2) Exploitation of subordinates
 - (3) Paranoia & aggression toward out-groups: conspiracy theories
 - b. Compensation for alienation & anomie through
 - (1) Intolerance of ambiguity
 - (2) Dogmatism
- C. Empirical evidence
1. Prejudice
 - a. Anti-Semitism no significant difference for general membership
 - b. Racial prejudice no significant difference
 - c. Homophobia significant difference
 - d. Anti-feminism significant difference
 2. Violence no significant difference
 3. Alienation no significant difference
 4. Rational choice
 - a. To support moderate pragmatists
 - b. To support radical extremists: non-Nazi support for Hitler in early 1930s
 5. Conclusion: members & leaders are more homophobic & anti-feminist
- II. Are members and leaders of the Christian Right **politically dysfunctional**?
- A. Participation
1. Explanations
 - a. Sociodemographic variables: class -- education & income
 - b. Theological variables: separatism & premillennialism of fundamentalists
 2. Empirical evidence **Figure 4.1, p. 102**
 3. Conclusion: more grassroots mobilization in 1990s could be good or bad
- B. Values of bargaining & compromise & civil liberties
1. Theological roadblocks
 - a. Moral certitude: God is on their side
 - b. Demonizing opponents: Satan is a real force
 - c. Principle is more important than compromise: inerrancy of Bible
 - d. Lack of support for civil liberties for opponents: good v. evil
 2. Empirical evidence
 - a. **“Core”** evangelical activists
 - (1) Definition
 - (2) Issue positions **Table 4.2, p. 104**
 - (a) Extremist: tolerance of diversity, abortion, gay rights
 - (b) More mainstream: school prayer, economic policy, affirmative action
 - (3) Compromise: **Table 4.3, p. 106** far less likely to bargain & compromise

- b. Grassroots' intolerance of civil liberties for those with "deviant" views to: atheists, homosexuals, socialists (p. 107)
 - (1) Speak in community
 - (2) Run for public office
 - (3) Engage in nonviolent political demonstrations
 - (4) Have literature in public libraries
 - (5) Teach in public schools & colleges
- 3. Conclusion: problems now, future uncertain
 - a. Aggravating factors
 - (1) Theological roadblocks
 - (2) Social and psychological pathologies
 - (3) Mixed messages from elites
 - (4) "Stealth" strategy of elites
 - b. Mitigating factors
 - (1) Political participation can reduce isolation
 - (2) Political participation can enhance
 - (a) Political efficacy
 - (b) Political trust
 - (c) Pluralist norm acquisition Figure 4.2, p. 110
 - i) Coalition building
 - ii) Support for civil liberties of opponents

III. Is the Christian Right **political agenda too radical**?

- A. A defensive reaction to successes of secular liberal movements: civil rights, feminists, gay/lesbian, environmental, ed. reform
- B. Decentralized movement produces complex and contradictory agenda
 - 1. Christian Coalition's *Contract with the American Family*
 - a. What it contains Box 4.1, p. 113
 - b. What it doesn't contain
 - (1) Total ban on abortion
 - (2) Opposition to gay-&-lesbian rights
 - c. Why: polling advised moderation
 - 2. Central issues of the Christian Right — dilemma:: fringe ideological purity of radicals v. centrist pragmatism of moderates
 - a. Anti-abortion: banning all v. banning all but "traumatic" (UT & LA) v. regulating
 - b. Christian education: secular humanism, creation science, abstinence ed., national standards, prayer, multiculturalism, home schools, vouchers
 - c. Opposition to "radical" homosexual agenda: sympathetic portrayal in ed. & media, protection against disc. in adoptions, marriage, jobs (esp. teaching & military) & housing, genetic explanations
 - d. Promoting traditional families: taxes (marriage penalty, child care, & homemaker IRAs), corporal punishment v. child abuse statutes, spousal abuse, unequal roles for women in society & family, privatizing welfare, reducing Medicaid
 - e. Pornography: adult v. children's access
 - f. A Christian nation: accommodation v. Christian reconstructionism
 - 3. Economic agenda: mixed reaction from white evangelicals, blacks, & Catholics
 - a. Eliminate minimum wage or add a subminimum wage
 - b. Return to the gold standard
 - c. Adopt protectionist foreign trade policies
 - d. Privatize welfare
 - e. Cut other social spending but increase defense spending
 - f. Replace the graduated income tax with either a flat tax or a sales tax
 - g. Reduce or eliminate environmental regulations
- C. Conclusion: not radical if pragmatic moderates dominate; but very radical if ideologues win