If we agree that America’s churches are its “first political institutions,” as Alexis de Tocqueville claimed, then Protestant clergy are a political “elite” worth studying. Certainly the role clergy has played within American public life has long been a focus of scholarly study. Historians have examined the public pronouncements of ministers during the American Revolutionary War, their involvement in the abolitionist movement of the mid-1800s, and, more recently, the public role of clergy in the civil rights era of the 1960s. Social scientists, on the other hand, began studying the theological beliefs and political engagement of clergy beginning in the late 1960s, largely with the advent of survey research that allowed them to gather information about the subjects under study.

Over the last half century, the involvement of clergy in public life has waxed and waned. In the late 1960s and early 1970s many clergy were involved in various civil rights and antiwar efforts. Dubbed the New Breed of clergy, these “liberal” pastors were on the front lines of national controversies. But, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, it was evangelical clergy who seemingly exhibited a rising level of political activism, as they appeared to shed their political quiescence in order to engage in efforts “to restore morality to American society and politics.”

Over the past decade, the Henry Institute has been engaged in research on clergy as a means to assess changes in the nature of their involvement in public life over time. Building upon an earlier effort in 1989 when a number of scholars surveyed randomly selected pastors across seven denominations, the Henry Institute coordinated efforts to survey randomly selected ministers across 18 Protestant denominations in 2001 and again across 10 Protestant denominations in 2009. Many of the theological and political questions contained in these Henry Institute surveys were identical to questions that had been posed in 1989. As a result, we now are able to assess how clergy have changed religiously and politically over the past two decades for the original seven denominations surveyed: the Assemblies of God; the Christian Reformed Church; the Disciples of Christ; the Presbyterian Church U.S.A.; the Reformed Church in America; the Southern Baptist Convention; and the United Methodist Church.

For purposes of analysis here, three denominations are classified as evangelical (Assemblies of God, Southern Baptist Convention, and the Christian Reformed Church—given the CRC’s association with the National Association of Evangelicals), with the remaining four denominations in the mainline Protestant denominations category.

The data reveal that some important changes have occurred among American Protestant clergy over the past two decades. For example, the growing “feminization of the clergy” is clearly revealed in the growing proportion of survey respondents who are female pastors—particularly so among mainline Protestant denominations. Table 1 demonstrates that the percentage of female clergy within the four mainline Protestant denominations jumped from 6.0 percent in 1989 up to 19.3 percent in 2009. And, while the percentage of females among evangelical clergy has also increased somewhat, it has done so only marginally (at least in the three particular denominations surveyed). Another trend evident from the data is the growing theological education evident among evangelical pastors, as the percentage of evangelical clergy who are seminary graduates has consistently increased over time (from 59.3 percent to 65.4 percent)—despite the fact that continued on page 2
neither the Assemblies of God nor the Southern Baptist Convention require their clergy to be seminary trained. Mainline Protestant clergy, on the other hand, are much more likely to be seminary graduates than are evangelical Protestant clergy, but the percentage of seminary graduates among mainline Protestant clergy has actually declined slightly over the past two decades (from 92.1 percent to 89.4 percent).

The surveys also included some theological queries over the twenty-year span of time, with some questions tapping historical tenets of the Christian faith and others asking about theological perspectives (e.g. liberation theology, feminist theology). Table 1 also presents responses to two theological questions—whether Jesus was actually born of a virgin and whether the devil actually exists. Though a majority of mainline Protestant clergy agreed with both statements in 1989, their level of concurrence with these two assertions was far less substantial than that found among evangelical Protestant clergy—as nearly all evangelical pastors reported agreement with both statements. And, while there has been no real change evident among evangelical ministers on these two theological questions over the past twenty years, there has been a growing level of agreement with both statements among mainline Protestant pastors. By 2009, nearly two-thirds of mainline Protestant clergy asserted that the devil actually exists, and nearly three-quarters concurred that Jesus was born of a virgin.

Clergy were also read a series of statements to assess their approval for pastors engaging in certain kinds of political activities. In Table 2, two such activities are analyzed—namely, clergy publicly taking a stand on a political issue and pastors publicly supporting a political candidate when both actions are done off the pulpit. Several patterns are evident. First, pastors are much more prone to approve taking public stands on issues of the day than they are to approve clergy publicly supporting political candidates.

Second, over the past two decades, there has been a decline in the level of approval for each of the actions among evangelical and mainline Protestant clergy. Third, for both evangelical and mainline Protestant clergy, the greatest decline in approval levels occurred between 1989 and 2001. And finally, evangelical Protestant clergy today are more likely than mainline Protestant ministers to approve of pastors engaging in both activities.

Of course, it is one thing to approve of an activity, and quite another to publicly take a political stand or publicly support a political candidate. Consequently, Table 3 examines whether clergy actually reported engaging in either of these two activities. Once again, several different patterns emerge. First,
not surprisingly, the percentage of evangelical and mainline Protestant clergy who reported having actually taken a public stand on some issue or publicly supported a political candidate in the past year was substantially less than the percentage reporting approval of such activity. Second, for both groups, there was a decline in actual activity between 1989 and 2001, followed by a general increase in such actions between 2001 and 2009. Third, while the percentage differences between the two groups were rather small in 1989, the difference was significantly more pronounced in 2009, with evangelicals substantially more likely than mainline Protestant ministers to report having taken a public stand on some political issue over the past year.

This report provides a brief glimpse of some of the patterns of continuity and change that are evident in the survey data. Over the next few months, more thorough analysis of the data will be conducted—examining, in part, how changes in theological orientations may be related to changes in political behavior among clergy within these seven denominations.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evangelical</th>
<th>Mainline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took a public stand on some political issue in past year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly supported a political candidate in past year</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Upcoming Henry Institute Lectures

- **September 16, 2010 at 3:30 p.m.**
  - **Politics in the Reigns of Saul and David**
  - Paul Abramson
  - Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University
  - Commons Lecture Hall in Commons Annex

- **October 13, 2010 at 3:30 p.m.**
  - **The Causes and Consequences of Religious Minority Repression in Muslim Countries**
  - Ani Sarkissian
  - Asst. Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University
  - Meeter Center Lecture Hall in Hekman Library Building

- **November 3, 2010 at 3:30 p.m.**
  - **The Rule of Law in Russia: Problems and Perspectives**
  - Andrey Shirin
  - Adjunct Professor, John Leland Center for Theological Studies
  - Meeter Center Lecture Hall in Hekman Library Building

- **November 17, 2010 at 3:30 p.m.**
  - **Diminished or Diverse? An Examination of the Political Voice of Churches in Democratic South Africa**
  - Tracy Kuperus
  - Professor of International Development Studies, Calvin College
  - Meeter Center Lecture Hall in Hekman Library Building
Reflections on the Life, Thought and Public Service of Paul Henry

In the fall of 2009, Henry Institute Director Corwin Smidt spoke to the Grand Rapids Historical Society about Paul Henry’s legacy. The following article is a synopsis of his remarks.

Paul B. Henry was born July 9, 1942 in Chicago. His early years were spent in Illinois and California; he graduated from Pasadena High School and then attended Wheaton College in Chicago. While an undergraduate, Henry worked as an aide for Congressman John B. Anderson of Illinois, leading to a long and lasting friendship between the two men. Also during his time at Wheaton College, Paul met his future wife, Karen Borthistle.

When he graduated from Wheaton in 1963 with a degree in political science, Henry joined the Peace Corps, working in Liberia and Ethiopia. He returned home in 1965, and Paul and Karen were married. Shortly thereafter, Paul enrolled in the Ph.D. program in political science as a Lilly Foundation Fellow in Christianity and Politics at Duke University. He again worked for Congressman John B. Anderson during his graduate school years, and he also pursued his interest in the relationship between Christian faith and politics in his studies. In 1970, Paul received his Ph.D. from Duke University.

From 1970 to 1978, Henry served as a professor of political science at Calvin College, teaching a variety of courses reflecting his dual interests in the theory and practice of politics. During his years at Calvin, he wrote a number of articles and books in which he outlined some of his basic Christian perspectives on politics.

In 1974, Henry was asked to serve as the new chairperson of the Kent County Republican Party. The following year, he was appointed to the Michigan State Board of Education, where he served until 1978 when he was elected to the Michigan State House of Representatives. In 1982, he moved on to the Michigan State Senate and then was elected to Congress in 1984. Paul served in the House of Representatives until his death in 1993.

Two weeks before Election Day in 1992, Henry was diagnosed with a brain tumor. He underwent surgery a few days before he was re-elected to his fifth term in Congress and regained sufficient strength to attend his swearing-in ceremony to the 103rd Congress. He died in Grand Rapids on July 31, 1993, at the age of 51, following a nine-month battle with brain cancer.

In 1997, Calvin College established the Paul B. Henry Institute for the Study of Christianity and Politics to continue Henry’s work of seeking to integrate Christian faith with political thought and action. In 1997, Calvin College established the Paul B. Henry Institute for the Study of Christianity and Politics to continue Henry’s work of seeking to integrate Christian faith with political thought and action.

In 1974, Paul authored his best known book, Politics for Evangelicals. The volume encompasses six general principles, which outline Henry’s political standards for politics and faith. He outlines his foundation for political action by discussing Christian humility and the need for mature Christian social and political ethics, which includes the ability to compromise. Henry firmly believed that there is an enormous need, and a definite call, for Christians to be involved in the political arena, and he affirmed the Reformed tradition calling Christians to transform the world around us. He believed strongly in our two-party system, and that within such a system, politicians (including Christians) were called to be pragmatic and principled and to exhibit honesty and charity in the search to reach their goals and make appropriate decisions for the good of their constituents and the country.

Throughout his public service, Paul Henry was known and admired for practicing political honesty and Christian charity, for his ability to find common ground, and for his wide ranging concerns for justice, fairness, the environment, and people. In part, what distinguished him from many of his colleagues was his ability to rise above partisan standards. While generally loyal to his party, he was not highly partisan. Henry deviated from party positions when he felt the issue called for a different stand, though he sought to work within the party when he was able. He was not obstinate or closed-minded about

In his book, Politics for Evangelicals, Paul Henry outlined six principles for Christian political engagement.

- **Principle #1:** The Need for Christian Humility
- **Principle #2:** The Need for a Mature Christian Social and Political Ethic
- **Principle #3:** The Need for Christian Political Engagement
- **Principle #4:** The Prudence of Working Within the Two-Party System
- **Principle #5:** Political Pragmatism
- **Principle #6:** Practice Political Honesty and Charity

Continued on Page 5

“Politics is not a simple battle between good or evil, or virtuous men and evil men, but rather it is about the give-and-take among competing interests and competing strategies for achieving a particular end.”
positions which he adopted, but was willing to learn and change positions when the evidence appeared to warrant it.

During his time in Congress, Henry served on the Education and Labor Committee, the Science and Technology Committee, and the Select Committee on Aging. His actions and accomplishments are many and include:

- Proposed legislation to restructure the Commerce Department to become the U.S. Department of Manufacturing and Commerce, in order to forge a functioning relationship between government and the struggling manufacturing sector.
- Opposed across-the-board drug testing of all public employees.
- Initiated a College Savings Bond Program.
- Pressed for improvements in air, water, and solid waste laws.
- Worked to establish a national beverage deposit law to increase recycling.
- Won the “Bulldog of the Treasury Award” for his efforts against wasteful government spending.
- Was a founding member of the Grace Caucus, seeking to implement the Presidential Task Force report on waste in government spending.

Paul Henry’s untimely death cut short what might have been an even more notable political career. Yet, even with his limited years in the Michigan legislature and Congress, there is much to honor about Paul’s public service. According to Smidt, “Paul was a humble, very capable and knowledgeable public servant. Given his theological perspectives, he was able to respect and work with individuals with whom he disagreed politically. Just as importantly, I believe that Paul’s constituents honored and respected him as a public servant—even when they did not necessarily agree with a particular policy position he adopted. Through his life and service, Paul brought dignity and honor to West Michigan politics.”

Serving the Claims of Justice by Douglas Koopman (published in 2001) provides more information about Paul Henry’s political ideology as well as timely and thoughtful contributions about how to integrate deep religious faith and the difficulties of political life.

Copies are available from the Henry Institute for $7, plus a $2 shipping fee.

Henry Institute Grants Undergraduate Research Awards

For the third year, the Paul Henry Institute will be providing a number of Undergraduate Research Fellowships, enabling Calvin students to work closely with faculty members in exploring a particular topic or field of study. The grants are intended to provide students with unique opportunities to gain more advanced scholarly research skills, while also encouraging a mentor-student relationship between the faculty member and fellowship recipient. The awards are provided for faculty research endeavors that focus on the interplay between Christian faith and public life. For the 2010-2011 academic year, three Undergraduate Research Grants were awarded.

Dr. Mandy Burrow of the Art and Art History Department will be working with student Tianna Wierenga to produce Voces (“Voices”), a project combining visual arts and social justice to address the issue of mass femicide in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. The project will involve ethnographic and historical research, with an end product exhibition of visual art intended to inform the audience about the social and political complications within the state of Chihuahua.

Dr. You-Kyong Ahn, Art and Art History Department, and Calvin student Elliot Spronk will complete a project focusing on preserving the symbolic and visual continuity of the Calvin College campus, as established by the original architect Bill Fyfe and Calvin President William Spoelhof. The original plan was designed to use the architecture and design of the campus and its buildings to represent the symbolic and programmatic integration of faith and learning.

Dr. Gail Zandee of the Calvin Nursing Department will continue her work exploring local disparities in health care in three underserved Grand Rapids neighborhoods. After collecting information to identify neighborhood health concerns and potential solutions, Zandee and the selected Calvin nursing student will work with the area residents to analyze the data and write a strategic health plan which addresses the concerns of residents and the disparities in health care.
Tensions at the Crossroads of Religion and Politics

On March 18, 2010, Michael Gerson delivered the 14th annual Henry Lecture. Gerson has served as top aide for President George W. Bush, and at the time of the lecture was a senior research fellow for the Institute for Global Engagement. The following is a summary of his remarks at the lecture.

Michael Gerson centered his lecture around the religious basis of human rights, asserting that any consideration of the topic must begin with history, more specifically with the Holocaust in the 1930’s and 1940’s. According to Gerson, this was the most important political event of modern times, and it has served an essential symbolic purpose: it represents the bottom of every slippery slope, the end of every dark hallway.

The Holocaust entailed events that were shocking to the world: racial purity laws, economic indignities, despairing suicides, liquidation of the disabled, deportations, ghettos, shootings, emptied orphanages, and terrified walks to the gas chambers. Consciences around the world were appalled that government, propaganda, bureaucracy and power had been harnessed to the causes of sadism and mass murder. The actions were also a broad indictment of European society, which held the idea that education and sophistication would serve as breaks on evil, an indictment of other nations who did little even after the crimes became obvious, and an indictment of German Christians who were often indifferent and sometimes even complicit in the crimes.

When World War II ended, the mood of many was hopeful, as people believed that the allies would inaugurate a new world order of justice. This expectation found strong expression in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which called for universal dignity and equal and inalienable individual rights.

In the view of much of the world, the Nazis had not only lost the War, they had been proven wrong. People believed that the Nazi vision of nation, race, and culture would be replaced by a recognition of universal human rights and dignity. But this was more an assertion than an argument, and even as the Universal Declaration was approved in 1945, challenges mounted. At the U.N., the Soviet Union, Saudi Arabia and South Africa refused to sign the Declaration, and opposing arguments began to be raised.

Some authoritarian regimes argued for a cultural exception to universal human rights, asserting that the Declaration was simply a tool of Western colonialism and that their cultural background and history exempted them from honoring universal human rights. Gerson noted that the problem with their argument was that it was fundamentally self-interested; history shows that governments asserting this objection are exclusively those with bad human rights records.

The second objection to universal human rights was similar to the cultural argument, but centered around alleged religious beliefs. Gerson offered, as an example, the Afrikaner population in South Africa, who used the Old Testament to justify their vision of white rule, viewing blacks as children of Ham and less than human. These white Christians protested outsiders judging their religious and political beliefs. Gerson again contends that, as was true of the first argument, this assertion that they speak for their religious tradition only represents a distorted version of that faith. Once again, the claim of exceptionalism is revealed as the tool of a self-interested ruling elite.

The third source of opposition comes from the West and arises from secular thought: it is a denial that human beings have natures that can be separated from their cultural circumstances. And, Gerson accedes that without some standard from outside culture, it is hard to define a standard of human rights. Without some statement by God or some reasoning that every human being is sacred, we are left only with the current consensus of our culture.

All of these objections have opened a rift at the heart of modern political liberalism, whose greatest achievements have included triumphs of human rights. Just as our bloody modern history has made the idea of human rights indispensable, philosophic consensus supporting the idea has weakened. Leaders of liberal societies everywhere are being challenged to justify and explain concepts they assumed were self-evident.

Why is the good of every human being a goal worth pursuing in its own right? In fact, it seems to be a mark of human beings to care for self, for family, for community, for clan, for tribe, for nation—but to care for every human being would seem to require a moral law. And to sacrifice for the rights of other human beings simply because they are human beings would seem to require a holy law.

Gerson noted that historian Michael J. Perry asserts that the attempt to find a firm secular basis for the idea of human rights has occupied philosophers for years, but none have gained universal assent. In fact, secular thought is nearly impossible to align with ideas that every human being has inherent dignity and that we should live our...
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lives accordingly.

This secular philosophical questioning places the religious justification for human rights in an even more important role. Religious contributions to this debate are both narrow and essential, and Christians must understand that most of the important elements of religious faith have no political relevance at all. When most tenets and beliefs of religion are imposed through government action, religion becomes just another interest group. But, says Gerson, there is one element of religious teaching that has direct and unavoidable public consequences: a Christian anthropology—that is, a belief in human worth, human nature, and human destiny. Why are human beings sacred? Philosophers have their own theories. Jews and Christians share a critical answer: men and women are created equal in worth in the image of God. We hold a belief that human nature demands human rights.

The Christian vision is important not only because it provides a solid foundation, but because it also transcends culture; it has the proven ability to stand in judgment of many cultures, including our own. People of faith have a unique ability to stand outside the prison of culture and call attention to a set of universal ideals—in other words, they can represent values of another Kingdom to the kingdoms of this world.

This is not an easy task, but a belief in universal ideals can exist without the presence of cultural arrogance. There are reasonable methods for applying universal ideals within different cultural contexts without the baggage of Western or modernized culture.

Nevertheless, in reality, the task of applying universal ideals is not easy because governing is often not easy. The proclamation of a human right does not guarantee some public policy. It is one thing to say, for example, that the people of Sudan should be rescued from violence. But those in government have responsibilities beyond moral clarity: will intervention be successful? what might be its unintended consequences? what other responsibility would this diversion of resources undermine? Even great nations have limited power to effect change.

Serious violations of human rights occur regularly, and there are often several morally advisable courses of action to pursue. But, prudence in making a choice is also a virtue. And frankly, notes Gerson, the moral views of Christians are sometimes simplistic—attempting to apply standards of individuals to the practice of the state is a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of government, which has the powers of life, death and coercion that are denied to individuals. These are powers that certainly can be abused, but these powers can also be used to defend the general welfare.

For all its complexity, however, certain principles of the Christian view of human rights are critical: human beings stand at the center of our concern, so sovereignty of the state is not absolute. The purpose of government is to serve people, not the other way around. And universal claims of human dignity reach across borders—human worth is not determined by rationality, and responsibilities for human dignity are not bounded by borders. This belief requires rejection of the simplistic foreign policy that holds the internal conduct of foreign regimes to be irrelevant to the conduct of American foreign policy. America promotes human rights for a realistic foreign policy reason: because brutal nations tend to be aggressive nations. But we also promote human rights because there are moral, as well as legal, wrongs and because some conduct is simply abnormal and inhuman.

Michael J. Perry writes, “If, as I suspect, there exists no plausible non-religious ground for the morality of human rights, then the growing marginalization of religious belief in many societies that have taken human rights seriously ... has a profoundly worrisome consequence. It may leave those societies bereft of the intellectual resources to sustain the morality of human rights.”

Gerson asserted that a vast majority of people who sustain human rights activism are likely to be motivated by faith. For this reason, people of faith have a tremendous responsibility. Their activism has never been more important to the welfare of millions. Much about the future of justice for the world will be determined by the successes and failures of the consciences of Christians.

The Holocaust Museum in Washington D.C. preserves artifacts of history’s greatest crime. The quote above the entrance to the museum reads: “We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.” This quotation from the Declaration of Independence was given this prominence because it is the negation of Nazism, a check on lawless, willful power, and the reflection of an idealism that makes us human. “This declaration would make little sense without the word “Creator”—the God who both grants our rights and calls us to the protect the rights of others.” concluded Gerson.

To order a copy of this lecture, contact the Calvin Campus Store and request Item V16279.

www.store.calvin.edu
Workshop on Survey Research and American Religion Held at Calvin

For a week during early June, 23 individuals participated in the seventh annual Henry Institute Graduate Student Workshop. The seminar’s focus is on measurement strategies for the study of religion in American public life. During the week at Calvin, the “Pollsters and Parishioners” workshop participants spend ten hours each day using various statistical databases, discussing theoretical approaches, examining measurement tools, and working on research projects.

The workshop is led by Corwin Smidt (Director of the Henry Institute at Calvin College and Professor of Political Science), Lyman Kellstedt (Political Science Professor at Wheaton College—emeritus), and James Guth (Political Science Professor at Furman University). The three are well versed in the study of religion and politics, having conducted numerous national surveys, taught many classes and workshops on the subject, and written numerous books and articles on the interplay between faith and public life.

A record number of applications were received from graduate and post-graduate students for the 2010 Workshop. “The selection of participants for the week was extremely difficult due to the many qualified and worthy individuals who applied. We have seen a dramatic increase in students who are interested in expanding their knowledge in this area, as well as in the number of people who are aware of the workshop,” noted Smidt.

The response of the participants was overwhelmingly positive. According to one, “The assignments given were very specific … we were trained not just in the abstract ideas involved in measuring religion, but also in the nuts-and-bolts realities.” Another student stated, “we were able to learn from one another and think about new ideas relating to religion and politics/civic life. It really was a great networking opportunity, and refreshing because we all share a desire to see the study and place of religion increase in our various fields.”

Smidt Nominated to be President-Elect of SSSR

Corwin Smidt was recently honored with the nomination for President-Elect of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion (SSSR), one of two candidates nominated to serve the leading scholarly organization related to the sociological study of religion. This marked the first time someone other than a sociologist of religion was nominated for the office. Given the SSSR’s traditional association with sociologists, Smidt doubted he would be elected, but considered it an honor to have been nominated for the position, perhaps paving the way for non-sociologists to hold the position in the future. Smidt was previously elected in June of 2008 for a three-year term on the Executive Council of the SSSR, filling a position designated exclusively for someone outside the field of sociology of religion. He continues to serve in this Executive Council role.
Disappearing God Gap Volume Published

After the reelection of George W. Bush in 2004, the “God gap” became a hotly debated political issue. Pollsters and pundits noted the tendency of those who were highly religious to vote Republican and those who were less so to vote Democratic in the American election process. Religious voters were seen as the key to Bush’s victory, and the Democratic Party began scrambling to reach out to them.

Four years after Bush’s second victory, with the economy in a tailspin on Election Day, religion barely seemed to register on commentators’ radar screens. Following the election, there was little discussion of religion—suggesting that religious factors had played little, if any, role in Obama’s victory. Yet, the campaigns themselves were full of religious stories.


In the book, the authors place the election in historical context and look at the campaigns from the primaries through Election Day. At the heart of their analysis is a national survey in which voters were interviewed in the spring of 2008 and then interviewed again after the election. The conclusions reached reveal that the role of religion in American presidential elections continues to structure vote choices, and rather than disappearing, will likely continue to influence electoral politics. The authors assert, however, that the “God gap” may be slowly changing, but in some important ways.

The book was published in February. And on March 16, the Brookings Institution in Washington D.C. hosted a panel discussion on the volume as part of the Governing Ideas series, which is intended to broaden the discussion of governance issues through forums on timely and relevant books on history, culture, legal norms and practices, values and religion. The event attracted more than 150 attendees and was moderated by Brookings Senior Fellow William Galston, with Smidt and denDulk representing the book’s authors, and Brookings Senior Fellow E.J. Dionne, Jr. offering his views on what the 2008 presidential election might reveal about religion’s role in the 2010 mid-term elections.

Following the Brookings event, Corwin Smidt talked with reporters from the PBS’s Religion and Ethics Newsweekly staff about the 2008 presidential campaign, the new book, and advice for both parties in advance of the 2012 campaign. He was also invited to give lectures related to the book at the University of Louisville, Georgetown University and George Mason University.


Symposium on Religion and Politics Scheduled for Spring 2011

From April 21-23, 2011, the sixth Paul Henry Institute Symposium on Religion and Politics will be held at Calvin College. The biennial event provides an opportunity for scholars studying the interplay between religion and politics to come together to present papers related to their current research, to foster personal and professional networks, to facilitate joint research endeavors, and to learn about research opportunities in the field.

Numerous panels are presented at the Symposium, with each panel including several papers on related topics that have been written by participants. Authors present their findings and conclusions, and the audience provides feedback and asks questions. A wide range of topics, interests, and religious backgrounds are present at each Symposium, leading to excellent discussions, extensive interaction, and lively conversations.

Symposium attendance is open to anyone interested in the areas of discussion, and both scholars and graduate students across different disciplines of study (for example, political scientists, sociologists, historians, and more) are invited to participate as presenters. Additional information about attending the Symposium and directions for submitting a proposal to make a presentation at the upcoming event can be found at the Henry Institute website.

www.calvin.edu/henry/schedule/symposium/2011Call.htm
God and Race in American Politics

Historian Mark Noll visited Calvin in September of 2009 to deliver two lectures. “God and Race in American Politics” centered around Noll’s recent book by the same name, and detailed how Christian believers have played a large role in the tangled fixation on race in the United States.

Noll outlined five distinct episodes in the interplay between race and politics in the United States, with the first beginning before the Civil War. At the time, slavery was an important aspect of life in the South, and while the northern states had abolished slavery, there were severe social restrictions on free black Americans. Religion entered the picture when northern abolitionists began using the Bible to attack slavery. Southern defenders responded with biblical “proof texts,” and argued that, since the Bible did not condemn slavery, those who attacked the practice must be opponents of the Bible.

As he examined the time period, Noll concluded that the American Civil War was actually a fundamentally religious event: the North viewed itself as God’s agent in the world, fighting oppression and injustice, while the South viewed them as infidel aggressors. Both sides used the authority of the Bible to chastise opponents, without evaluating and correcting their own opinions. Furthermore, no distinction was made between slavery in general versus the racially specific, black only slavery being practiced in the U.S. at the time—which would cause tensions and issues that remain with us today.

Act 2 began when the North won the war. Lincoln abolished slavery and Congress granted civil rights to freed slaves, but the abolition of slavery did not equate to the abolition of racism. The South converted their biblical interpretations into practices and laws ensuring that black Americans remained subordinate to whites. Even in the North, civil rights were only reluctantly and partially provided. Still, black Americans took advantage of their relative freedom to create churches of their own. As discrimination, Jim Crow Laws, and racial harassment limited participation in public life, church life became increasingly central to the African American community. Noll asserted that this growth of church influence (though barely visible and not recognized by most Americans at the time) was actually the most important development after the Civil War.

As soon as the northern army left, the South implemented harshly repressive black codes that all but eliminated black civil rights. Lynching and vigilante justice was frequently practiced and widely condoned, with almost all white churches accepting Jim Crow segregation and assaults on justice. In the North, pervasive segregationist practices made blacks second-class citizens, and most northern churches exhibited indifference to civil rights.

The third historical installment examined the effects of the Civil War on U.S. politics. In the South, the Republican Party of Lincoln was viewed as the cause of destruction, and the Democratic Party championed Jim Crow Laws. The Republicans were stronger in the North, but to pacify southern states, they backed limited federal government and free trade. This less powerful central government allowed the Democratic Party and southern states to keep blacks out of politics, while the northern states benefited from a growing industrial life and powerful business interests.

An inherent and important paradox accompanied this chapter of development: republican principles and the political system strengthened economic prosperity and allowed local communities to flourish as secure social centers for whites, offering a good environment for church growth and local religious development. Yet, these principles simultaneously allowed racism to flourish, permitted states to stifle democracy, equated American patriotism with minimal federal government power, and contributed to immoral and racial tyranny.

Noll’s fourth act encompassed the Civil Rights Movement. Between 1900 and 1950, religion primarily upheld the status quo, allowing civil religion to flourish. World War II was cast as the defense of Christian civilization against atheism, and the subsequent Cold War was seen by many Americans in terms of the threat godless Communism posed to Judeo-Christian values. The actual impetus for the Civil Rights Movement arose from Soviet propaganda that condemned the U.S. call for freedom in the world as hypocrisy, since Americans continued segregation and discrimination at home.

In response to the Russian accusation, the 1950’s brought government action, including desegregation in the military and in education. Black churches emerged as forceful voices for change, using prophetic language to condemn racist practices. The Civil Rights Movement incorporated many factors: biblical roots; Black

“Racial history in the U.S. is a cesspool of iniquity that has poisoned the nation’s public life since before the nation began. ... but for those who believe that where sin abounds, grace abounds even more, we might be able to find signs of redeeming hope ...”
Remembering James Penning, 1949 to 2010

With great sadness we mourn the unexpected death of James Penning on July 13, 2010. Jim was a loved and respected colleague, and he was very involved in numerous endeavors of the Paul Henry Institute.

As an avid investigator at the intersection of politics and religion, Penning was the co-author of five books as well as an author and co-author of numerous articles on subjects such as the Christian Right, evangelicalism, and the Christian’s responsibility to the public sphere. His most recent co-authored volume was The Disappearing God Gap: Religion in the 2008 Presidential Election.

"Jim was a great colleague and a dedicated scholar," noted Corwin Smidt, Director of the Henry Institute, who collaborated with Penning on much of his work. “He approached his work with enthusiasm and modesty. We shared many research interests, and because Jim was such a pleasant person with which to work, we collaborated together on a substantial number of scholarly endeavors—including conference papers, journal articles, political surveys, and co-written books.

“Yet, while a scholar, it was who Jim was as a person that struck a responsive chord from other scholars around the country. When hearing of his death, those sending emails not only extended their condolences but frequently attested to how much they appreciated Jim as a person.”

Penning focused his teaching at Calvin on state and local politics, urban politics, and public policy. He served as the Chair of the Calvin College Department of Political Science four times and organized two conferences on Christianity and politics. He was also instrumental in developing an extensive program of state and local internships and mentoring opportunities for Calvin’s political science students. “He was a person in some ways ahead of his time in terms of experiential education and the value those opportunities provide for young people,” according to Smidt.

Penning was a past president of the Michigan Conference of Political Scientists and served on the Grand Rapids Planning Commission, the Kentwood City Commission, and the Baxter Community Center board. Penning had served as the director of Calvin’s Center for Social Research since 2008.

Jim initially studied education as a student at Calvin and planned on becoming a high school teacher. But he changed his major to political science and later earned his M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Kentucky, graduating in 1975. He joined the Calvin faculty the same year.

Jim’s dedicated scholarship and study, his engaging teaching, as well as his wonderful sense of humor and sincere care for others will be sorely missed. He modeled the life that he taught, staying faithful to his Christian ideals and beliefs while also engaged in the world.

God and Race (continued from Page 10)

intellectual development; religious self-sacrifice; and non-violent direct action. Black leaders preached eloquently, and many were stimulated to action, but the innovations of pacifism and non-violence were as disturbing to many white Americans as the biblical religious references were familiar.

In what he called the final chapter of this examination, Noll explored the complications that followed civil rights reform. First, extending civil rights across solidified racial barriers required the most comprehensive extension of government authority since the Civil War, broadening federal control well past civil rights and deeply into other parts of society. Other groups (such as women and homosexuals) began to use civil rights tactics for their causes. Political allegiances and party stances changed as well.

Noll concluded his lecture by noting that for many years, white Christians failed in the history of civil rights, allowing abuses to continue without strongly objecting to the injustice. “The self interest and sinful pride of American white believers was allowed to triumph over Christian altruism and the mandate to ‘love your neighbor as yourself’ for much too long,” according to Noll. “Racial history in the U.S. is a cesspool of iniquity that has poisoned the nation’s public life since before the nation began. But for those who believe that where sin abounds, grace abounds even more; that God is Lord of history from beginning to end; we might be able to find signs of redeeming hope in our national past and possible hope in what is yet to come.”

To order a copy of this lecture, contact the Calvin Campus Store and request Item A16019.

www.store.calvin.edu
Participation in Catholic-Evangelical Colloquium

On February 20, 2010, the Henry Institute sponsored a regional colloquium on public policy issues that invited both evangelical and Roman Catholic scholars. Participants included delegates from Calvin College, Wheaton College, and Notre Dame University. Much of the discussion centered on Lew Daly’s recent book God’s Economy: Faith-Based Initiatives and the Caring State, and Mr. Daly also attended to participate in the conversations.

The colloquium was the outgrowth of a group of Roman Catholics and evangelicals from across the United States who have met over the past several years to facilitate discussions. Stephen Monsma of the Henry Institute and Cathleen Kaveny of Notre Dame Law School, who are both part of the national group, organized the day in order to explore further the nature, extent, and limits of common ground between the Catholic and evangelical traditions in terms of approaches to public policy issues. Those attending the event agreed that the Kuyperian perspective of the Reformed tradition and Catholic beliefs and doctrines have significant common ground that warrants further conversations.

“This was an extremely valuable dialogue and one that hopefully will lead to additional discussions,” noted Steve Monsma, Senior Research Fellow of the Henry Institute. “The evangelical and Catholic traditions share agreement on many basic values and beliefs that underlie a Christian approach to today’s public policy issues. This colloquium was an important step toward further work together in this area.”

Over the past academic year, Henry Institute Director Dr. Corwin Smidt traveled to the Netherlands and to Russia where he was invited to present his research and deliver a number of talks. In October of 2009, Smidt went to Amsterdam to offer a paper at a conference commemorating four centuries of Dutch-American relations. The event was co-organized by the Roosevelt Study Center in Middleburg, Virginia and the Vrije University of Amsterdam. Portions of his presentation, along with quotations from interviews conducted during Smidt’s stay were subsequently published in two major daily newspapers in the Netherlands following the conference.

In April of 2010, Professor Smidt traveled to Russia, where he had been invited to deliver four lectures on religion and public life at the newly formed Spiritual Institute of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow. The Institute was established in March of 2009 by Patriarch Kirill, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church, with the goal of equipping the Church with high quality, professionally trained bishops, administrators, and diplomats. Smidt also spoke to students and faculty at the Russian-American Institute where his lecture was titled: “How Religion Can Strengthen Russian Public Life.”

“The formation of this Institute and the invitations given to scholars from the West to speak at the Institute are signs that the Russian Orthodox Church is changing,” according to Smidt. “It is seeking to understand the thought and empirical realities related to the interplay of church and public life as it

continued on page 13
The Henry Semester in Washington D.C. Program provides an opportunity for Calvin students to live and work in the nation’s capitol, experiencing first-hand the interplay between religion and public life. Throughout the 10 years that the program has been in existence, more than 140 young people have participated in the spring semester program.

The students work four days each week in an internship position for a wide variety of organizations, businesses, and government offices or agencies. Some of the participants fulfill the practicum requirement for their social work degree through these placements. Valuable employment experience, mentors, reliable references, and sometimes even job offers are gained through their internships.

One day each week is spent visiting cultural sites or meeting individuals who work at religious organizations that are actively involved in the political realm. These opportunities provide the experiential foundation of the “Integrating Faith and Public Life” class, giving students extensive opportunities to absorb the unique sites and culture of Washington D.C. while evaluating their experiences through the lens of Christian faith and action.

During the fall term prior to their time in Washington D.C., the participants take a class where they learn to develop resumes and cover letters, hone job interviewing skills, and also obtain additional information about the city, cultural sites and living in the nation’s capitol.

During the 2010 Semester, students experienced several “firsts.” Washington D.C., a city which normally does not see much snowfall, was shut down for nearly a week due to extensive storms, delaying the start of student internships.

In addition to the weather anomaly, the diversity in the fields of study for participating students has become more pronounced. For example, in 2010, the first science major participated in the program, as one biochemistry student joined the group. Each year, a Calvin College professor accompanies the students and teaches the courses in Washington. During 2010, Henry Institute Executive Director Corwin Smidt led the D.C. Program. He has accompanied the program participants several times and has always been impressed with the caliber of the students and the value of the semester. He noted, “The sixteen students in this year’s group were unanimous in believing it was a very positive experience that taught them much and helped equip them to pursue a variety of endeavors after graduation.”

Moscow Lectures (continued from page 12)

exists within contexts where there is a more defined separation of church and state than exists in Russia. The Russian Orthodox Church has realized that the recovery of church property following the collapse of the Soviet Union has not resulted in the recovery of spiritual vitality among the Russian people. However, the purpose of this engagement with Western

The Russian Orthodox Church’s Cathedral of Christ the Savior in Moscow

thinking is still unclear; it may relate to some projected time in which the Russian Orthodox Church experiences a new relationship with the state, or it may be directed toward an effort to confront practices that will foster greater religious vitality among individuals who consider themselves Orthodox Christians within Russian society today.” ~
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God and Government

Lewis Daly, a Senior Fellow from Demos, a think tank in New York City, delivered a lecture in February about the federal policy known as the faith-based initiative, established by George W. Bush in 2001. According to Daly, the policy finds much of its basis in Catholic and Dutch Calvinist traditions.

The faith-based initiative was intended to reintegrate religious social providers into the public social service system and to level the playing field for religious providers of social services, through inclusion and additional funding. Totally unique in presidential history, the faith-based initiative sought to reconstruct the entire public welfare system through providing a vision for faith-based social provision, greater cooperation between church and state, and more religious freedom for faith-based contractors.

Daly called the faith-based initiative an exciting new story about very old ideas. For the past twenty years, a rich heritage of European religious ideas about government and society have subtly and powerfully impacted America’s quest for welfare reform and an end to poverty. The emergence of these ideas took place within the devolution of U.S. welfare policy, as responsibility was transferred from the federal level to the states, then to local government, and finally to public/private partnerships.

According to Daly, public U.S. debate in the early 2000’s was dominated by ideological interest groups creating fear about religion’s involvement in public welfare provision, but it is precisely the religious ideas behind the faith-based initiative policy that may hold the key to a new war on poverty. Examination of Catholic and Dutch Calvinist theories of the limited state that shaped the design of the faith-based initiative, as well as understanding the historical development of the social welfare states that arose on these foundations later, can offer a view for future efforts in the United States.

The foundation behind the initiative reaches back to the mid-19th century in Europe: socialism and the welfare state threatened to destroy the bond between the people and the church as government assumed control over areas then under the purview of religious organizations, such as education and social welfare. The church began to actively challenge laissez faire liberalism and capitalism to bring government and market forces under moral and democratic control. The growing specter of poverty among plenty lent credence to the church’s accusation that political welfare and private capitalism were marks of a staggering social and cultural decline.

The Catholic concept of subsidiarity, officially formulated in 1931, reaches back to early Christianity’s bottom-up view of how the parts and the whole are related within the state. Dutch Calvinist sphere sovereignty, championed by Abraham Kuyper, emerged in the late 19th century in the Netherlands. Both movements focused on religious autonomy and its authority in society.

Kuyperian and Catholic teaching saw private economic and public government power as joint threats to social autonomy and the natural social sustaining order of family, church, and community. Neither viewed freedom of the church simply in terms of limiting state purview over religion, believing that society’s growing enslavement to capitalism left workers and families defenseless against destructive economic power that defied any Christian standard of order or common justice.”

“Kuyperian and Catholic teaching … believed that society’s growing enslavement to capitalism left workers and families defenseless against destructive economic power that defied any Christian standard of order or common justice.”

Catholic subsidiarity was built on Pope Leo 13th’s concept of freedom of the church which asserted communal religious autonomy, protecting institutional integrity and self governance of religious groups within the political order. This independence and autonomy of churches was derived from the free exercise (or conscience rights) of individual persons, rather than from the state assigning the church its sphere of influence and granting the church rights of practice.

Gradually, Pope Leo’s thoughts began to be applied to other social institutions, and the argument that such community institutions, particularly family and church, are more proximate (natural) institutions of society was argued to infer that the state must leave social tasks to them while also ensuring their autonomy to carry out these tasks. As more proximate institutions, they received unique authority directly from God; without their survival and nurture, humanity could not survive. Subsidiarity, in fact, requires the state to support the natural communities (especially the family) in fulfilling their God-given tasks and to actually intervene and use state resources to support the social institutions if the natural community is threatened.

Sphere sovereignty, the unique contribution of Dutch Calvinist
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political thought, grew out of similar circumstances and reactions against the French Revolution’s ideas of liberalism, including concepts of liberty and equality, popular sovereignty, social contracts, the artificial reconstruction of society—notions which today are seen as cornerstones of constitutional law. These liberal concepts were believed to remove God as the ultimate source of authority and judgment in human institutions.Sphere sovereignty asserts that freedom comes into the world through the conformity of human law with a higher moral law—namely God’s order of justice.

Abraham Kuyper became the champion of sphere sovereignty, arguing that God is sovereign over all created things and has divided life into unique spheres, with each sphere having a certain measure of power, given by God and with no one sphere holding absolute power. The state’s purpose was to make it possible for the various social spheres to interact appropriately, keeping each within its proper limit and protecting the individual from the tyranny of the group. The proper order of society ensures the flourishing of many self-governing spheres exercising their proper authority from God, which then ensures justice.

According to Daly, the U.S. should evaluate these historical ideas and assess what the resulting systems of Christian Democracy have to say about our country. When the U.S. is compared to European countries where practices similar to Bush’s faith-based initiative have actually functioned, one finds that these nations are among the least impoverished and most equal countries in the world.

Both Germany and the Netherlands, for example, upheld social pluralism in their social welfare systems and are examples of the Christian Democratic model of social capitalism, recognizing the autonomy and self governance of social groups and organizations, but striving for harmony within all the sectors of society. The cornerstone ideal is to ensure that families are able to fulfill their natural capacities and obligations, with the proper role of the caring state being modification of the wage system to guarantee a living family wage. Family allowances, minimum social income, and unemployment and pension benefits with very high replacement rates prevent the volatility and instability that lead to problems and families dissolving.

In these two countries, the state is subsidiary in the sense that it is a source of help for social structures and natural assignments, but not a replacement for them. Economic controls and government-run programs are severely disfavored, and power of the state’s control of service delivery.

Bush deviated from the historical roots of the faith-based initiative by maintaining his unquestioning loyalty to economic liberalism. When first describing the faith-based initiative as the next phase of the war on poverty, he failed to recognize the necessity of a much greater commitment than that of the Great Society welfare programs he was rejecting. Many critics continue to underestimate the faith-based initiative because they see it only within Bush’s understanding and intention, failing to comprehend just how deeply the roots and heritage of the concept actually lie.

Sphere sovereignty and subsidiarity require independence and neutral funding for even the most religious of social service providers—but these principles don’t operate in a social vacuum, with the primary goal being simply increasing religious involvement in social services. To the contrary, subsidiarity and sphere sovereignty are a means in the service of a broader goal: the good of communities, the good of families, and the good of social structures.

“Christian Democracy actually repudiates charity in favor of the public transfer of resources, yet embraces religion in the very design of social services,” according to Daly. “The responsibility of the state is limited by the sovereignty of social structures, but does not stop short of adjusting market outcomes. Finding this balance between social sovereignty and market control first generated this social question in 1891, when these concepts started. Going forward, I urge us to look more closely at history as we proceed under Obama with continuing efforts to develop our faith-based initiative in the United States.”

To order a copy of this lecture, contact the Calvin Campus Store and request Item A16278. www.store.calvin.edu
2009-2010 Lectures Sponsored by the Henry Institute

The Paul Henry Institute sponsored and co-sponsored a number of public lectures over the past academic year. Highlights of some of these events are included in this newsletter, and audio recordings of many of the lectures are available from the Calvin Campus store—www.store.calvin.edu—(reference the number noted after the lecture when you order).

The Life and Work of Paul B. Henry by Corwin E. Smidt, Director of the Henry Institute given on September 10, 2009 [V15980] Summary on page 4

God and Race in American Politics by Mark Noll, Professor of History at Notre Dame University given on September 17, 2009 [A16019] Summary on page 10

World Christianity and American Christianity: What About the Future? by Mark Noll, Professor of History at Notre Dame University given on September 18, 2009 [A16020]

Transformation in Jesus by Tamrat Layne, former Prime Minister of Ethiopia given on September 30, 2009 [V15990]

The Disappearing God Gap? Religion and the 2008 Presidential Election by Corwin E. Smidt, Director of the Henry Institute given on October 7, 2009

Perspectives on the Slums of Nairobi, Kenya: What is the Role of the Churches? by Christine Bodewes, Office of Human Rights in Kibera, Nairobi given on October 20, 2009 [A16093]

Backwater, Bellwether, Barometer? Personal Spirituality, Organized Religion and Public Life in the Pacific Northwest by Patricia O’Connell Killen, Provost and Professor of Religion at Pacific University given on November 16, 2009

The Third Choice: Islam, Dhimmitude and Freedom by Rev. Dr. Mark Durie, Vicar of St. Mary’s Anglican Church in Caulfield, Australia, given on January 18, 2010

God and Government by Lewis Daly, Senior Fellow at Demos, given on February 19, 2010 [A16278] Summary on page 14

Tensions at the Crossroads of Religion and Politics by Michael Gerson, Senior Fellow at the Institute for Global Engagement, given on March 18, 2010 [V16279] Summary on page 6