

Religion and Politics

POSC 312

Spring 2011

MEETINGS: BM 220, MWF 9:30-10:20am

INSTRUCTOR: Dr. Paul Djupe

PHONE: 587-6310

OFFICE AND HOURS: Knapp Hall 305-B, MWF 10:30-12:30, other by appointment

E-MAIL: djupe@denison.edu

COURSE FILES: S:/Academic Projects/Djupe/POSC 312-01

Course Overview: This is a course about democracy – how religion helps to solve and exacerbate the primary problems of mass democracy. Churches and other religious organizations provide many important resources to individuals, including representation of their beliefs to the public sphere as well as the skills, inspiration, and opportunity to pursue their own civic concerns. In an age of declining social capital, we look to the remaining and new social organizations to subsidize the civic resource deficits drawn by television, suburbanization, unequal access to education, etc. But at what cost? Intolerance, extreme opinions?

We begin the course with an attempt to delimit the playing field – constitutional definitions of how religion and government are allowed to (and should) interrelate. While Thomas Jefferson argued there must be a “wall of separation” between religion and the state out of mutual protection, the reality is that religion and government are intertwined on various levels with ramifications for both. We then proceed with an organizational approach to religion and politics – how organized religious groups attempt to influence and are influenced by the public sphere.

Books: (available in the book store and are required)

- Alley, Robert S., ed. *The Constitution and Religion*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus. ISBN: 9781573927031
- Djupe, Paul A. and Laura R. Olson, editors. 2007. *Religious Interests in Community Conflict: Beyond the Culture Wars*. Waco: Baylor University Press. ISBN: 9781932792515.
- Putnam, Robert, and David Campbell. *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*. New York: Simon & Schuster. ISBN: 9781416566717.
- Other readings will be made available within a reasonable time or are available through “online resources” through the library.

Format: It will be quite rare for me to talk for a significant portion of the class. In order for you to get something out of the class and to help others have a meaningful class, you must read the material before class. Most often class sessions will revolve around a discussion of the issues brought out by the readings, which does not mean that I will teach the readings. In fact, the assignment of material does not imply my endorsement of it – we are free to critique and dismiss material as we see fit or treat the reading as a data source. Notice that class participation is included in the final grade. Raising questions, making comments, and sharing ideas are welcome and, in fact, mandated in class.

Assignments and Worth

<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Grade Distribution</u>
Four short papers	60	
Lit reviews	25	
Class attendance and participation	15	
Total	100%	

Explanation of Requirements

Attendance and Participation (15%) This is not a fudge factor. I expect you to come to class prepared to engage the material, your colleagues, and me. I value the classroom conversation, I mean for it to be a two-way conversation and not a lecture, and this is my way of placing value on it. Instead of coming to class *for* a set of notes, I expect you will come to class *with* a set of notes that will enable a discussion to take place. Democracy takes work. Institutions help (here, the lit reviews). If you miss more than 3 unexcused classes, you will forfeit your attendance points. Those who faithfully come to class and say nothing can expect to receive about 66% of their attendance points (that's still a D).

Four Short Papers (60% total) These papers will be free from grammatical and spelling errors and will vary a bit in length and worth. There are four points in the semester when a paper will be due, noted in the *Schedule* below. Questions for each paper are listed on pp 7-8.

Lit reviews (25% total) One of the most valuable skills to learn is how to represent key elements of a literature, so you will get some practice here with 7 (out of a possible 8) short, one page review pieces (described on p 7). They will also encourage you to read since you cannot complete these without having a good understanding of these pieces and how they comment on the other readings. Moreover, because of that necessary groundwork, they will enable your participation in class discussions. I regard these are integral to a good course experience; previous students have too. Do not low ball how much time these will take you.

Important Course Policies

Due Dates and Excuses The due dates are prescribed to fit into a larger schedule. The semester is fairly evenly spaced so that the work of the course is paced. If you see a conflict coming (a campus event, 10 papers due the same day, etc.), PLAN FOR IT IN ADVANCE! Extensions are granted on a case by case basis, and not for, "I'm really busy." If you are ill, I expect a short communicate alerting me of your absence (emergencies obviously excepted, but get someone to call and make arrangements with me soon). I will not reschedule the course for you. Your late, unexcused work will not be able to earn top grades – see **Late Assignment Policy** below. Further, it is not acceptable to claim a disk error for late work since the network is reliable and accessible to everyone. Therefore, use your network account (U:).

Late Assignment Policy Each day (including weekends and holidays) your work is late and unexcused, you lose 5 percent from your final grade for that assignment. So: the top possible grade for an assignment 3 days late is an 85 (or B). You must alert me to your valid excuse before the assignment is due, not when you are handing it in late. Failure to complete all assignments results in a failing grade for the class.

Electronic Submission Please submit your assignments by email as a Word document or pdf. Please also include all figures and tables, if applicable, within the same document. Thus, I want one document for each assignment. It is not acceptable to paste the text of your paper into an email. If submitting your paper electronically, the paper will be subject to the Late Assignment Policy if you forget to attach it to the email.

Paper Formatting Any material or ideas you use from an outside source should be cited appropriately in the text and included in a works cited list at the end of the paper (you can begin this on the last page of your paper). ALL written assignments completed out of class should include citations whenever you reference the work of another person. Citations must adhere to the

Turabian/Chicago Manual of Style **parenthetical** approach with a works cited section. Note that in this approach footnotes/endnotes are not used for citations, but clarification of an idea. More info and examples of this approach can be found at:

http://www.press.uchicago.edu/books/turabian/turabian_citationguide.html.

Still, applying the citation style to certain sources, such as court cases and internet sources can be challenge. When in doubt do your best to mimic the style and include as much relevant information as possible. Failure to cite sources correctly or include a works cited section could result in up to a 25% grade penalty and in extreme cases could be considered an act of plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

Attendance Policy My basic rule is that you forfeit your attendance points if you miss 3 or more unexcused classes (not more than 3). However, mere attendance is not enough to earn full credit; if you attend religiously and speak nary a word you will earn about two-thirds of your attendance points. Make an effort to be an active participant in class and you will benefit, not just by earning your attendance points, but in all your coursework.

Accomodations Any student wishing an accomodation based on the impact of a disability should contact me privately as soon as possible to discuss your specific needs. I rely on the Office of Academic Support to verify the need for accomodation based on their office files.

Academic Honesty The Denison academic dishonesty policy can be found in the Student Handbook on page 25. Any incidence of academic dishonesty in this course will result in your failure of this course and referral to the Denison judicial process. There is never a problem if you keep your eyes to yourself and properly cite and reference sources of information and ideas.

Grading Policy Final grades are based roughly on a 90 (lowest A), 80 (lowest B), 70 (lowest C), etc., scale. I prefer not to specify exactly what the grading scale will be so I have the flexibility to curve the scale a bit to fit the class distribution.

DAILY SCHEDULE

Week	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
1/17	Getting Acquainted & Definitional Matters	M No reading W Definitional Debates: What is religion? Putnam and Campbell ch1. Djupe, Paul A. & Christopher P. Gilbert. 2009. <i>The Political Influence of Churches</i> . Cambridge UP. Ch1 {tbd} F Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. 2005. <i>The Churching of America: 1776-2005</i> . Rutgers UP. Ch 1. {tbd} Putnam and Campbell ch 3&4. Maps!: http://www.rcms2010.org/maps.php	
First Amendment Questions			
1/24	Religion in a Democracy: Philosophical Views	M Madison, James. 1787. "Federalist 10." Tocqueville, Alexis de. [1945/1835]. "Religion Considered as a Political Institution Which Powerfully Contributes to the Maintenance of a Democratic Republic Among the Americans." In <i>Democracy in America</i> , Volume 1, chapter 17; "Indirect Influence of Religious Opinions Upon Political Society in the United States." In <i>Democracy in America</i> , Volume 1, chapter 17; and "How Religion in the United States Avails Itself of Democratic Tendencies." Volume II, Book 1, Chapter 5. (all available through google books)	

		<p>W Macedo, Stephen. 2000. <i>Diversity and Distrust</i>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp 149-187.[tbd]</p> <p>Fish, Stanley. 1999. <i>The Trouble with Principle</i>. Cambridge: Harvard UP. Pp 153-161 (at least) [tbd].</p> <p>Rorty, Richard. 1994. "Religion as Conversation-Stopper." <i>Common Knowledge</i> 3(1): 1-6.</p> <p>F <i>Jesus Camp</i> (the movie), no reading</p>	LR1 due
1/31	Establishment Case Law	<p>M Discuss <i>JC</i> then discuss</p> <p>Madison, James. [1785/1962]. "A Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments."</p> <p>Jefferson, Thomas. <i>An Act Establishing Religious Freedom</i>. (both in the Alley book or google them)</p> <p>Jefferson, Thomas. "Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists." (google it)</p> <p>W <i>Everson v. Board of Education</i> (1947) (p 47) (busing)</p> <p><i>McCullum v. Board of Education</i> (1948) (p 165) (clergy in schools)</p> <p><i>Abington Twp v. Schempp</i> (1963) (p 179) (reading 10 Cs)</p> <p>F <i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i> (1971) (p 82) (aid to religious schools)</p> <p><i>Marsh v. Chambers</i> (1983) (p 288) (legislative chaplains)</p> <p><i>Lynch v. Donnelly</i> (1984) (p 297) (creche display)</p>	LR2 due
2/7	The Current Establishment Regime	<p>M <i>Grand Rapids School District v. Ball</i> (1985) (p 117) (teachers in private schools)</p> <p><i>Larkin v. Grendel's Den</i> (p 281) (church veto)</p> <p><i>Zobrest v. Catalina</i> (1993) (p 270) (deaf interpreter)</p> <p>W <i>Lamb's Chapel v. Moriches Union</i> (1993) (p 374) (religious film)</p> <p><i>Rosenberger v. University of Virginia</i> (1995) (p 392) (religious newspaper)</p> <p><i>Zelman v. Simmons-Harris</i> (2002) (vouchers)*</p> <p>F <i>Christian Legal Society v. Martinez</i>, 08-1371 (2010)*</p> <p><i>Van Orden v. Perry</i> (545 U.S. 677 2005)* & <i>McCreary County v. ACLU of Kentucky</i> (545 U.S. 844 2005)*</p> <p><i>Locke v. Davey</i> (540 U.S. 712 2004)*</p>	LR 3 due
2/14	School prayer then Free Exercise Case Law	<p>M <i>Engel v. Vitale</i> (1962) (p 171)</p> <p><i>Lee v. Weisman</i> (1992) (p 249)</p> <p><i>Sante Fe Independent School District v. Jane Doe</i> (No. 99-62, 2000)*</p> <p>W <i>Reynolds v. U.S.</i> (1879) (p 414) (polygamy)</p> <p><i>Cantwell v. Connecticut</i> (1940) (p 420) (Jehovah's Ws)</p> <p><i>Minersville School District v. Gobitis</i> (1940) (p 427)(")</p> <p><i>West Virginia SBE v. Barnette</i> (1943) (p 428) (flags)</p> <p><i>Braunfeld v. Brown</i> (1961) (p 437) (sabbath work)</p> <p><i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> (1963) (p 449) (sabbath work)</p> <p>F <i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i> (1972) (p 466) (school enrollment)</p> <p><i>Employment Division of Oregon v. Smith</i> (1990) (p 483) (peyote)</p> <p><i>Church of Lukumi Babalu v. Hialeah</i> (1993) (p 502) (animal sacrifice)</p>	LR4 due (only on free ex)
Deliberative Religion?			
2/21	Empirical Work on Religion and Deliberative Democracy	<p>M Mutz, Diana and Jeffrey Mondak. 2006. "The Workplace as a Context for Cross-Cutting Discussion." <i>Journal of Politics</i> 68(1): 140-155.</p> <p>Putnam and Campbell. Ch 13 (443-479).</p> <p>W Djupe, Paul A. and Jacob R. Neiheisel. 2008. "Clergy Deliberation on Gay Rights and Homosexuality." <i>Polity</i> 40(4): 411-435.</p> <p>Neiheisel, Jacob R., Paul A. Djupe, and Anand E. Sokhey. 2009. "Veni, Vidi, Disseri: Churches and the Promise of Democratic Deliberation." <i>American Politics Research</i> 37(4): 614-43.</p> <p>F Djupe, Paul A. and Brian R. Calfano. 2010. "The Deliberative</p>	Monday 2-21, Paper 1 due LR5 due

		Pulpit? The Democratic Norms and Practices of American Religion.” Paper delivered at the MPSA, Chicago. {tbd} Djupe, Paul A., Laura R. Olson, and Andrew Gordon. 2010. “Religious Liberalism in a Gay Rights Debate: Commitment to Deliberative Values and Practice in ELCA Congregations.” Paper presented at the SSSR. {tbd}	
2/28	Paper 2 Presentations	M Shields, Jon. 2007. “Between Passion and Deliberation: The Christian Right and Democratic Ideals.” <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> 122(1): 89-113. http://bit.ly/ebUnHe http://abcn.ws/d9RRZ2 http://bit.ly/hS31EV W Presentations, part i F Presentations, part ii	
3/7	<i>Religious Interests in Community Conflict</i>	M Djupe and Olson, chs 1-2, 4 W Djupe and Olson, chs 7-8 F Djupe and Olson, chs 9-11	Friday, 3-11 Paper 2 due
3/14	s p r i n g b r e a k		
Tolerance, Participation, and Opinions			
3/21	Religion & Tolerance	M Gibson, James L., and Kent L. Tedin. 1988. “Etiology of Intolerance of Homosexual Politics.” <i>Social Science Quarterly</i> 69: 587-604. Burdette, Amy M., Christopher G. Ellison, and Terrence D. Hill. 2005. “Conservative Protestantism and Tolerance Toward Homosexuals: An Examination of Potential Mechanisms.” <i>Sociological Inquiry</i> 75(2): 177-196. W Reimer, Sam and Jerry Z. Park. 2001. “Tolerant (In)civility: A Longitudinal Analysis of White Conservative Protestants’ Willingness to Grant Civil Liberties.” <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> 40: 735-745. Jelen, Ted G. and Clyde Wilcox. 1990. “Denominational Preference and the Dimensions of Political Tolerance.” <i>Sociological Analysis</i> 51(1): 69-81. F Djupe, Paul A. and Samantha Webb. “Fair and Balanced: Threat Perceptions of Homosexuals Among Evangelical Protestants.”[tbd] Djupe, Paul A., Jacob R. Neiheisel, Laura R. Olson, and Anand E. Sokhey. “The Tolerant Clergy: Does Urging Tolerance Help or Hurt Attempts at Persuasion on Immigration?” Paper presented at the SSSR.	
3/28	The Midwest	M Putnam and Campbell chs. 14-15. Djupe, Paul A. and Brian R. Calfano. Forthcoming. “American Muslim Investment in Civil Society: Political Discussion, Disagreement, and Tolerance.” <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> . W No Class W or F. I’m in Chicago for the MPSA conference, presenting: F Djupe, Paul A. and Anand E. Sokhey. 2011. “The Bands that Bind: A Network Basis for the Gender Gap in the Vote.” Djupe, Paul A. and E. Harry Brisson. 2011. “The Effects of Descriptive Associational Leadership on Political Engagement.” Djupe, Paul A. and Brian R. Calfano. 2011. “Explaining the Evangelical Crackup: An Experimental Test of Mechanisms for the Liberalization of American Evangelicalism.”	Monday, LR6 due (using last week’s and Monday’s reading)
4/4	The Heart of the Matter: How Does Religion Shape	M [Basic Approaches] Kellstedt, Lyman A., John C. Green, James L. Guth, and Corwin E. Smidt. 1996. “Grasping the Essentials: The Social Embodiment of Religion and Political Behavior.” In John C.	

	Political Attitudes?	<p>Green, James L. Guth, Corwin E. Smidt, and Lyman A. Kellstedt, eds. <i>Religion and the Culture Wars: Dispatches from the Front</i>. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. {tbd}</p> <p>Wald, Kenneth D., Dennis Owen, and Samuel Hill. 1988. "Churches as Political Communities." <i>American Political Science Review</i> 82: 531-48.</p> <p>W [Beliefs]</p> <p>Guth, James L., John C. Green, Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Corwin E. Smidt. 1995. "Faith and the Environment: Religious Beliefs and Attitudes on Environmental Policy." <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 39(2): 364-382.</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A. and Patrick K. Hunt. Forthcoming. "Beyond the Lynn White Thesis: Congregational Effects on Environmental Concern." <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> 48(4): 670-686</p> <p>F [Values]</p> <p>Mockabee, Stephen T. 2007. "A Question of Authority: Religion and Cultural Conflict in the 2004 Election." <i>Political Behavior</i> 29: 221-248.</p> <p>Calfano, Brian R. and Paul A. Djupe. "Divine Intervention? The Influence of Religious Values on Support for U.S. Interventionism." [tbd]</p>	<p>LR7 due</p> <p>Friday, 4-8 Paper 3 Due At midnight</p>
4/11	Religion & Gender Issues	<p>M [Elites]</p> <p>Hofstetter, C. Richard, John W. Ayers, and Robert Perry. 2008. "The Bishops and Their Flock: John Kerry and the Case of Catholic Voters in 2004." <i>Politics and Religion</i> 1(3): 436-455.</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A. & Gregory W. Gwiasda. 2010. "Evangelizing the Environment: Decision Process Effects in Political Persuasion." <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> 49: 73-86.</p> <p>Calfano, Brian R. and Paul A. Djupe. 2009. "God Talk: Religious Cues and Electoral Support." <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> 62(2): 329-39.</p> <p>W Putnam and Campbell, pp 231-246.</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A., Anand E. Sokhey, and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2007. "Present but not Accounted for? Gender Differences in Civic Resource Acquisition." <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 51(4): 906-920.</p> <p>Ozorak, Elizabeth W. 1996. "The Power, but not the Glory: How Women Empower Themselves Through Religion." <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> 35(1): 17-29.</p> <p>F Olson, Laura R., Sue E.S. Crawford, and James L. Guth. 2000. "Changing Issue Agendas of Women Clergy." <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> 39(2): 140-153.</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A. and Laura R. Olson. 2010. "Stained-Glass Politics: Does Women's Associational Leadership Engender the Political Engagement of Women?" Paper presented at the MPSA.</p>	<p>LR8 due</p>
4/18	Putting Rep. Peter King (R-NY) to the test	<p>M http://thinkprogress.org/2011/01/11/king-muslims-american/ http://lat.ms/gVl0NN Other reading, tba</p> <p>W In computer lab for (re)intro to statistical analysis</p> <p>F More in the lab</p>	
4/25	In the lab	<p>M More in the lab</p> <p>W Course evaluations in Higley 325, 9:30-9:50</p> <p>F More in the lab</p>	
5/2	Paper 4: Wednesday, May 4th, midnight	<p>M Last Class! (in the lab, if needed)</p> <p>Paper 4: Wednesday, May 4th, midnight</p>	<p>Paper 4: May 4th, midnight</p>

Literature Reviews

- Each is worth 3.6% – 25% total
- Everyone must write the first one and then can choose to write 6 of the next 7.
- Start with the core question and offer a brief justification – why is this important? Smart introductory paragraphs will also map out the review by highlighting the themes or tensions to be discussed.
- The goal of the literature review is to map the major questions, theories, and findings of the literature, highlighting its significance – what big theories does it confirm, what aspects of democracy does the literature help us understand, etc. Essentially, what has lead to disparate findings and what do we know? Comment on any significant gaps left in the literature, as far as you can tell, or methodological problems you can discern.
- Especially good reviews will close by (briefly!) posing directions for the literature to travel next – the next set of questions, methods to employ, etc.
- Each review is to be 1 single-spaced page in length with 1 inch margins and either Times New Roman or Garamond font. As in any paper, include appropriate citations using the approved in-text citation style (see the University of Chicago guide). Don't bother with a reference list since it will simply be what is listed in the syllabus. Of course, all readings need to be cited.
- In each review, you will not be able to use names in the text (outside of parenthetical citations, which are obviously a must), no references to article or book titles, and no quotations. You therefore must write about the conversation of ideas between the authors. You will also incorporate all readings from within the scope of the review as listed in the covered dates.

A Guide to Short, Happy Papers

These papers are intended to be short thought papers that deal with topics we discuss in class. They are not simple reiterations of our discussions and will be attempts to integrate class discussion into something bigger and, perhaps, more meaningful. Some details follow:

- Length: Most about 6 pages, double-spaced, using 1” margins and a normal font (Times New Roman or Garamond (my fav) – no Arial or Courier). See additional information on pp 3-4.

Questions and Due Dates

Paper 1 Worth 15% Due: Monday, 2-21	Making sense of the First Amendment: When hearing a case, Justices are guided by more than the Constitutionality of the practice involved in the case. They are also thinking about how they want to allow religion to function in society. So, through the big picture view of 120 years of first Amendment case law, what should be the role of religion in U.S. society according to the Supreme Court and how has that view evolved?
Paper 2 Worth 20%	Democratic theorists frequently discuss the challenging nature of “religious” arguments, arguing that they stop conversation, are unreasonable, etc. Test out this

<p>Due: Friday, 3-11</p>	<p>notion with some peers and tell us how it went. That is, we have a clear hypothesis from the literature about how religious arguments function in everyday discussion. Then, armed with that hypothesis, create a test in a way you find most appropriate. For instance, you could ask them to think of religious arguments for a political issue that they would present to friends and one they would present in a public forum, or you could ask them to evaluate the religiousness of some arguments and their suitability for public consumption. There are obviously other possibilities. Regardless, winning papers will exhibit tight links between the tensions in the deliberation readings (weeks of 1/24 and 2/21) and your data gathering efforts. To spur your efforts, we've scheduled presentations for 3-2 and 3-4 – they'll last about 6 minutes, which leaves about 4 minutes for dialogue. The paper is due a week later (sometime before you leave for break), which gives you time to incorporate any comments from the class into your final paper. Also, this one will likely be longer – probably in the neighborhood of 10 pages.</p>
<p>Paper 3, Choice 1 Worth 10% Due: Friday, 4-8</p>	<p>In this paper, I want you to start with the work on religion and democratic deliberation and how they have studied religion and politics. Use their approach to comment on the research done on religion and tolerance (week of 3-21). Are they in accord (have they studied religion in the same way)? Using the deliberation work as inspiration, what would you recommend religion and tolerance research do next? If they adopt a different approach, what do you imagine they would find?</p>
<p>Paper 3, Choice 2 Worth 10% Due: Friday, 4-8</p>	<p>Read Charles Truehart's article and Tony Jones' first chapter (I'll provide it) discussing the evolution of how people experience religion in America and speculate how these changes in practice and organization will shape religion's effects on citizen political behavior. Jones, Tony. 2008. <i>The New Christians: Dispatches from the Emergent Frontier</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. {tbd} Truehart, Charles. 1996. "Welcome to the Next Church." <i>The Atlantic Monthly</i> 278(2): 37-58.</p>
<p>Paper 4 Worth 15% Due: Wednesday, 5-4</p>	<p>Rep. Peter King (R-NY), as the incoming Chair of the Homeland Security Committee, has promised to hold hearings in the House regarding Muslim extremism and Muslims' lack of cooperation in the investigation of suspected terrorist activities. While he appears to be talking in terms of anecdotes he has heard about, we have access to data! We'll head to the lab to investigate what Muslims think and do about a wide variety of things political. We'll have access to their patriotism, participation and interest in politics, religiosity, tolerance, personal experience with intolerance, among other things. The precise question you investigate is up to you. You'll pose a question (use a question mark in the first paragraph), discuss the significance of the question (why do we care about this?), discuss what data you're using. Then describe the variable(s) you're trying to explain, and proceed with your explanation. Conclude by readdressing the question and think about the broader significance of your results. You can take more pages than 6 if you need them and don't consider tables or figures in a page count.</p>