

RELIGION AND POLITICS

POSC 312

Fall 2017

MEETINGS: Knapp 301, MWF 11:30-12:20am

INSTRUCTOR: Dr. Paul Djupe

OFFICE AND HOURS: Knapp Hall 305, MWF 12:30-1:20, W 2:30-3:30 and by appointment

E-MAIL: djupe@denison.edu

“Our form of government has no sense unless it is founded in a deeply felt religious faith, and I don't care what it is.”

—President-Elect Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1952

“A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source.”

—James Madison, 1787

Course Overview This is a course about democracy – how religion helps to solve and exacerbate the primary problems of mass democracy. We are living through a time when religion defines contours of many political and social debates in the United States, perhaps more now than ever before (or for a long time at least). Once we get a handle on what democracy and religion are (realizing that both are contested terms), then we'll begin with how religion fits in democratic theory.

Of course, this is not just a theoretical exercise and despite grounding in legal language, the nation's highest court weighs in to define what role religion can play in American politics and culture. This section will culminate in our own mock trial.

Lastly, we can examine evidence of how citizens do or do not make room for citizens they profoundly disagree with and how religion shapes those judgments.

Learning Goals

Critical Thinking – the course is set up to pit perspectives against each other to try to expose their weaknesses and, more importantly, to make progress in a dialogue about religion and democracy. You will develop the ability to target and work through the disagreement. But we also play with perspective shifts through, primarily, different definitions of religion set it varying conditions. This is not disagreement, per se, and it is just as important to the development of critical thinking to seek to make sense of different clusters of arguments.

Ethical Reasoning – Democracy serves no purpose without disagreement and the sides are often lopsided. The course is motivated by how we treat religious minorities, even ones we may fundamentally disagree with on multiple levels. My premise, which may not be your premise, is that we want to compose a society that maximizes freedom, counterbalanced by reciprocity to our collective benefit. Can we compose rules that are more inclusive?

Writing skills – I place a premium on developing writing under the notion that you cannot think clearly unless you can communicate it effectively. We will work on how to describe arguments as well as different styles of argument (legal, normative, empirical).

Reading

- Djupe, Paul A. and Ryan R. Claassen, editors. Forthcoming. *The Evangelical Crackup? The Future of the Evangelical-Republican Coalition*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Other readings will be made available within a reasonable time or are available through the library or interwebs.

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 this seminar.

ASSIGNMENTS AND WORTH

<u>Assignments</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Grade Distribution</u>
Five papers	80	(varying value for each)
Class attendance and participation	10	
Presentations	10	(2 at 5% each)
Total	100%	

EXPLANATION OF REQUIREMENTS

Attendance and Participation (10%) This course demands your active participation. Note that 10 percent of your grade is at stake here, and perfect attendance is not adequate to earn it all. You must also ask questions, suggest answers, and continue the dialogue of this course. I keep track of attendance. The course rule is that you forfeit your attendance points if you miss three or more classes (unexcused absences). People who never say anything in class but attend perfectly receive about 2/3 of attendance points (that’s still a D).

Five Papers (80% total, each varies in worth) These papers will be free from grammatical and spelling errors and will be from 3-10(ish) pages in length. There are five points in the semester when a paper will be due, noted in the *Schedule* below. Paper are described on pp 7-8.

Presentations (10% total) You are going to give 2 short presentations across the semester. More on those later in the syllabus. Each is worth 5%.

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.

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 It is mandatory to submit your assignments on Notebowl as Word docs.

Paper Formatting Papers are expected to conform to the *Political Science Research Paper Style Guide*, which I'll distribute.

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 Proposed and developed by Denison students, passed unanimously by DCGA and Denison's faculty, the Code of Academic Integrity requires that instructors notify the Associate Provost of cases of academic dishonesty. Cases are typically heard by the Academic Integrity Board which determines whether a violation has occurred, and, if so, its severity and the sanctions. In some circumstances the case may be handled through an Administrative Resolution Procedure. Further, the code makes students responsible for promoting a culture of integrity on campus and acting in instances in which integrity is violated. Academic honesty, the cornerstone of teaching and learning, lays the foundation for lifelong integrity. Academic dishonesty is intellectual theft. It includes, but is not limited to, providing or receiving assistance in a manner not authorized by the instructor in the creation of work to be submitted for evaluation. This standard applies to all work ranging from daily homework assignments to major exams. Students must clearly cite any sources consulted—not only for quoted phrases but also for ideas and information that are not common knowledge. Neither ignorance nor carelessness is an acceptable defense in cases of plagiarism. It is the student's responsibility to follow the appropriate format for citations. Students should ask their instructors for assistance in determining what sorts of materials and assistance are appropriate for assignments and for guidance in citing such materials clearly. *For further information about the Code of Academic Integrity, see <http://denison.edu/academics/curriculum/integrity>.*

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
8.28	Definitional Matters	<p>M Definitions: What is religion? What is democracy?</p> <p>W No class W or F – I’m in San Francisco for the APSA (our annual meeting) presenting:</p> <p>F Djupe, Paul A., Anand E. Sokhey, and Amanda J. Friesen. 2017. “Social Dominance Orientations, Gender, and the Participation Gap in American Politics.”</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A., Jacob R. Neihsel, and Kimberly H. Conger. 2017. “Religious Nones in the States: Are the Politics of the Christian Right Linked to Rates of Religious Non-identification and Non-affiliation?”</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A., Amy Erica Smith, and Anand E. Sokhey. 2017. “Explaining Gender in the Journals: How Submission Practices Affect Publication Patterns in Political Science and Sociology.”</p>	
9.4	2 of 3 Roles of Religion in a Democracy: Pluralism and Civic Republicanism	<p>M Discuss results of the first paper.</p> <p>W Madison, James. 1787. “Federalist 10”</p> <p>Madison, James. [1785/1962]. “A Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments.”</p> <p>Jefferson, Thomas. <i>An Act Establishing Religious Freedom</i>. See p2 http://www.virginiamemory.com/docs/ReligiousFree.pdf</p> <p>F 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 (scroll down from the last one); “How Religion in the United States Avails Itself of Democratic Tendencies.” Volume II, Book 1, Chapter 5.</p> <p>Transcript of President George Washington's Farewell Address (1796) (search for religion in the doc). http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=15&page=transcript</p>	<p>M: First paper due before class</p> <p>Paper 2, Part I due Friday</p>
9.11	The Third Role: Deliberation	<p>M Gutmann, Amy and Dennis Thompson. 2004. <i>Why Deliberative Democracy?</i> Princeton: PUP. Pp. 1-29. [tbd]</p> <p>W Rorty, Richard. 1999. “Religion as Conversation Stopper.” In <i>Philosophy and Social Hope</i>. New York: Penguin Books. [tbd]</p> <p>Macedo, Stephen. 2000. <i>Diversity and Distrust</i>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 149-187.[tbd]</p> <p>F Carter, Stephen L. 1993. <i>The Culture of Disbelief</i>. New York: Basic Books. [Chapter 11 – tbd]</p> <p>Wolterstorff, Nicholas. 2003. “An Engagement with Rorty.” <i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i> 31(1): 129-139.</p>	Paper 2, Part II Due Friday
9.18	Enough Assumptions: What do they say? How do they do it? With what effect?	<p>M Coe, Kevin & David Domke. 2006. “Petitioners or Prophets? Presidential Discourse, God, and the Ascendancy of Religious Conservatives.” <i>Journal of Communication</i> 56: 309-330.</p> <p>Chapp, Christopher B. 2012. <i>Religious Rhetoric and American Politics</i>. Ithaca, NY: Cornell. [ch3 – tbd]</p> <p>W Pat Buchanan; Trump Advisor; KY Governor and again here; Texas special session; state constitutions; Moore</p> <p>F Djupe, Paul A. and Kimberly Conger. 2012. “The Population Ecology of Grassroots Democracy: Christian Right Interest Populations and Citizen Participation in the States.” <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> 65(4): 927-940.</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A., Jacob R. Neihsel, and Kimberly H. Conger. 2017. “Religious Nones in the States: Are the Politics of</p>	Paper 2, Part III due Friday

		the Christian Right Linked to Rates of Religious Non-identification and Non-affiliation?” [tbd]	
9.25	The Deliberative Potential of American Religion: Reciprocity or Constraint?	<p>M Neiheisel, Jacob R. and Paul A. Djupe. 2008. “Intraorganizational Constraints on Churches’ Public Witness.” <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> 47(3): 427-441.</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A. 2014. “The majority its ministering prophet’: The Social Regulation of American Religion.” [tbd]</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>Djupe, Paul A. and Laura R. Olson. 2013. “Public Deliberation about Gay Rights in Religious Contexts: Commitment to Deliberative Norms and Practices in ELCA Congregations.” <i>Journal of Public Deliberation</i> 9(1) Article 1.</p> <p>F I’m out of town today.</p>	Paper 2 en toto due Friday
Constitutional Law			
10.2	The Current Establishment Regime	<p>M <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>W <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> <p>F <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>	F: Paper 2 due.
10.9	School prayer then Free Exercise Case Law	<p>M <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>W <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> <p>F <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>	
10.16	Free Exercise	<p>M No Class – Fall Break</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)(more JWs)</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> <p><i>Gonzales v. O Centro Espirita Beneficente Uniao do Vegetal</i>, 546 U.S. 418 (2006)*</p>	
10.23	The Photog, the Baker, the Candlestick Maker: Do I have to Serve you? Trying the Extent	<p>M <i>Burnell v. Hobby Lobby</i> (573 US ___ 2014)* and a new free ex case, tbd</p> <p>W Politics of Religious Liberty. Visit by Andy Lewis</p> <p>Djupe, Paul A., Andrew R. Lewis, and Ted G. Jelen. 2016.</p>	F: Paper 3 due

	of Free Ex Claims	“Rights, Reflection, and Reciprocity: Implications of the Same-Sex Marriage Debate for Tolerance and the Political Process.” <i>Politics & Religion</i> 9(3): 630-648. F Judgment Day – Oral Argument and Collective Deliberation	
The Evangelical Crackup?			
10.30	Evangelical Crackup?	M <Oral Argument> Done. W Djupe and Claassen, Ch 1; Grant and Searcy Ch 7; Djupe and Burge, “ Measurement Error is Sin. ” Kirkpatrick, David D. 2007. “ The Evangelical Crackup. ” F Layman and Brockway Ch 2; Claassen Ch 3	
11.6	Evangelical Crackup?	M Lewis Ch 5; Bennett Ch. 14 W Djupe and Calfano Ch. 1; den Dulk Ch 4; F Djupe et al. Ch 11; Djupe, Neiheisel and Sokhey “ Did Disagreement over Trump Drive People out of their Churches? ” Djupe, “ American Religion is Not a Matryoshka Doll. ”	
11.13	Evangelical Crackup?	M Taylor, Gershon, and Pantoya Ch 9; Castle Ch 8; Burge, Ryan, “ Will Evangelical Millennials Change the Narrative? ” W Section IV chapters (I’ll make a Notebowl folder) F Miller, Paul D. 2017. “ Social Conservatism vs. Tribal Nationalism. ” Djupe, Paul A. 2017. “ Did Evangelicals hold their noses and vote for Trump? ” Bailey, Sarah Pulliam. 2016. “ The Trump effect? A stunning number of evangelicals will now accept politicians’ ‘immoral’ acts. ”	
11.20		THANKSGIVING BREAK! Save a bird, eat a bean.	
11.27	<i>Presentation Groups 1</i>	M 1-4 W 5-8 F I’m out this Friday at a book conference.	F: Paper 4 due
12.4	<i>Presentation Groups 2</i>	M 9-12 W 13-16 F 17-20	Paper 5 due next week
12.11	The. End.	M ¡Conclusion!	

A GUIDE TO SHORT, HAPPY PAPERS

Papers must conform to the citation and reference styles described in the **Political Science Research Paper Style Guide**, which I'll distribute.

QUESTIONS AND DUE DATES

<p>Paper 1</p> <p>Due: Monday, 9-4</p> <p>Length: ~4p</p> <p>Value: 10%</p>	<p>What different definitions of religion are there? What are their political implications? This is a thought exercise. Check out the following links and chapters. You are reading them to capture how they define religion. Once you have them, write them down in a list, "According to X, religion is..." Then once you have that list, write about 3 pages talking about how they differ and what you think the definitions might mean for religion's connection (significance) to democracy and politics. There are no right answers, but some are probably more on point and thoughtful than others.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. http://www.thearda.com/mawizard/ Check out the "Salience, Scripture and Prayer" and the "Religious/Metaphysical Beliefs" section2. http://www.pewforum.org/2015/05/12/americas-changing-religious-landscape/3. Djupe, Paul A. & Christopher P. Gilbert. 2009. <i>The Political Influence of Churches</i>. Cambridge UP. Ch1 {tbd}4. Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. 2005. <i>The Churching of America: 1776-2005</i>. Rutgers UP. Ch 1. {tbd}5. http://www.nytimes.com/2003/05/17/opinion/god-and-george-w-bush.html
<p>Paper 2</p> <p>Due: End of each week for each stage, Final paper due 10-8</p> <p>Length: <10p</p> <p>Value: 20%</p>	<p>Adjudication between the "three perspectives"</p> <p>We will spend two weeks getting a handle on what I call the three perspectives of how religion can support democracy – 1) Madisonian pluralist, 2) Tocquevillian civic republican, and 3) deliberative. For each week, I would like you to write a literature review of one page in length to define and place the perspectives in debate. So, for the first week (beginning 9.4), please write about pluralism and civic republicanism. For the second week (9.11), write about the deliberative perspective and related debates. After that we will review two weeks of evidence related to the three perspectives – what do political and religious elites talk about and what are the effects of religious communication? Write a review of the first week of evidence (week of 9.18). Then, after the fourth week, put it all together – set up the debate between the three perspectives and bring evidence (that we discussed in class) to evaluate which perspective is most descriptive of religion's role in democratic life. Take another week to do this, so the final paper is due 10.8 In the conclusion try and do two things – 1) what kind of evidence (what sorts of stories) we need to advance this discussion and 2) what would you say at this moment about whether religion is supportive of democracy or not?</p>
<p>Paper 3</p> <p>Due: Monday 10- 30 (argument) and Monday</p>	<p>Oral Argument and Brief Writing in <i>Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado</i>.</p> <p>We will have spent three weeks discussing Supreme Court decisions in constitutional law cases involving the First Amendment religion clauses. A fitting end is to engage in argument over how the Supreme Court should decide the pending <i>Masterpiece</i> case (the Court's oral argument will take place about a month after ours). The twist is that we will divide into three groups – 1) pro <i>Masterpiece</i>, 2) anti <i>Masterpiece</i>, and 3) Justices – which you will carry through the assignment. Your group will argue from your role in a one class session argument with 25 minutes allocated per side. We will talk about this more in class, but this is</p>

<p>11-6 for the paper</p> <p>Length: ~20 minutes per side plus a paper of less than 10 pages</p> <p>Value: 20%</p>	<p>just like oral argument before the Court – you should prepare every angle, know the facts of the case, and know relevant precedent (to keep the scope manageable, I won't grill you on obscure precedent we didn't discuss in class). Justices will likely interrupt your presentation with questions.</p> <p>Then, a week later, you will deliver your argument in writing (Justices decide the case) in less than 10 pages in the same fashion as argument – cite precedent, present the facts, apply the law as you interpret it (or as the Justices should interpret it).</p>
--	--

<p>Paper 4</p> <p>Due: Final 2 weeks of class for presentation, final Friday of class for the paper</p> <p>Length: ~10 minutes Plus a paper of less than 10 pages</p> <p>Value: 30%</p>	<p>The Political Connections of Religious Groups</p> <p>After a semester of exploring religion and politics in the US and specifically after reading <i>The Evangelical Crackup?</i> it is time to deploy this knowledge and perspectives toward a group of your own choosing. I posted that list on NB with your names attached to it in case you've already forgotten.</p> <p>We're building toward a presentation that would last about 10 minutes; this will constitute our class for the remaining bits of the semester, doing about 4 a day. You will also submit a paper to go along with it that will be due at the end of the semester. The paper should be in the neighborhood of 7-10 pages, not counting any tables, figures, or other supporting documents.</p> <p>Draw on what we're read in the <i>Crackup</i> for inspiration about directions to head with these groups. To be clear, they draw on a variety of (perhaps non-exhaustive) sources of evidence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Institutional decisions, output, press releases, reports – denominations and interest groups often keep online archives of this material. 2) News coverage – we have access to Lexis/Nexis Academic Universe, which is a great resource for this. 3) Academic coverage – my species has written about many of these groups and you are free to borrow their insights and documentation (with citation of course). 4) Public opinion – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pew has good coverage of groups (google “religious landscape survey”) b. Cooperative Congressional Election Study with its enormous Ns has great coverage, though you would have to run the numbers yourself (I can help!). It covers every congressional election cycle back to 2006. c. There are other data sets depending on the group. If you're interested in this route, hit me up. 5) http://thearda.com/rcms2010/ has maps of the distributions of all of the denominations and religious traditions in our list. There are also maps going
--	--

back in time (2000, 1990, 1980, 1971).

Clearly, the exact question framing is going to differ depending on what group you pick, what evidence you can locate, and what concerns you are most interested in. So, start now.

By Monday 11-13, please poke around for evidence and give me a draft plan (including a question) that lists available evidence that suggests what you're going to do is feasible.