



VOICE OF REASON

The Journal of Americans for Religious Liberty

2016, No. 2 [135]

The Election Results: An Overview of the Primaries and Caucuses, March 5-May 3

The following analysis consolidates mountains of data from exit polls and county returns in this intense election season, in which nearly 50 million voters have already cast primary and caucus ballots to choose our next president.

These articles include comprehensive data and interpretation from the primary sources of voting statistics, exit polling, and comparisons from previous election campaigns. You will find more relevant material condensed here than in any other publication.

Our writer is ARL research director and VOR editor Al Menendez, who has served as an election consultant for ABC News and for NBC News. His previous political books include: *Religion at the Polls*; *Evangelicals at the Ballot Box*; *The Perot Voters and the Future of American Politics*; *The Geography of Presidential Elections in the United States, 1868-2004*; and *The Religious Factor in the 1960 Presidential Election*.

Our next issue will look at the conventions, party platforms that address church-state concerns, and vice presidential nominees, as well as the role of religion in the general election. —Edd Doerr

Caucuses

There were caucuses in 13 states, characterized by low turnouts and closed to all but party members. No exit polls were conducted except in Iowa. Cruz and Sanders did better in these settings than in primaries.

Cruz won Alaska (March 1), Kansas and Maine (March 5), and Hawaii (March 8); Trump carried Nevada (February 23), Kentucky (March 5), and Hawaii (March 8).

Sanders was victorious in Colorado (March 1), Kansas and Nebraska (March 5), Maine (March 6), Idaho (March 22), Alaska, Hawaii, and Washington (March 26). Clinton won Iowa (February 1) and Nevada (February 20).

Primaries

Most state primaries, except Arizona, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, and Utah, included exit polls that produced enormous amounts of data.

Michigan, March 8: Called “the epicenter of American anger,” by *The Washington Post* a week before its primary, Michigan lived up to that assessment by going for Trump and Sanders.

Trump won 37%, while Cruz (25%) edged out Kasich (24%) for second place. He won 62% among anti-immigrant and pro-deportation voters, and 45% among those who oppose free trade. Trump carried most of the state, especially in the Detroit suburbs and the Upper Peninsula, while Cruz carried most of Dutch-oriented western Michigan areas that had supported Huckabee in 2008 and Santorum in 2012. Trump ran third in the Dutch counties, and Kasich carried Ann Arbor (home of the University of Michigan) and Kalamazoo.

Evangelicals voted for Trump, with Cruz second, while non-evangelicals also went for Trump, with Kasich second. There was no

category for Catholic voters, but a local Michigan poll found a solid margin for Trump. Heavily Catholic Macomb County, a blue-collar Detroit suburb once noted for its ‘Reagan Democrats’, gave Trump 48%, with Kasich a distant second.

Sanders won his first big-state victory in Michigan by two percentage points, carrying most small cities and rural areas, and sweeping 60% in the Upper Peninsula, a rural swing area that resembles Wisconsin with its “older” ethnic groups of Finns, Swedes and Germans. One of his biggest triumphs came in predominantly Arab-American Muslim Dearborn, where he won 63%. The *Arab-American News* endorsed him. “The narrative of Arab-American Muslims in Dearborn supporting a Jewish can-

continued on page 3



Inside:

Battles for the Religious Blocs	2
A Summing Up	5
Who Voted for Trump?	7
Contraceptive Conflict May Be Headed to Resolution	9

Regular Features

Church and State in the Courts	9
Voucher Watch	10
Updates	12
International Updates	13
ARL in Action	13
Books and Culture	14

Battles for the Religious Blocs

While the influence of religion has clearly waned in American life, according to numerous reliable surveys, it retains a political punch.

Evangelicals

Since white evangelicals are about 40% of Republicans, their vote has become a primary source of commentary. Evangelicals are increasingly divided. *Washington Post* religion reporter Michelle Boorstein wrote on March 19: "Indeed, for a decade, U.S. evangelicalism, which has no formal leadership or hierarchy, has been increasingly divided over who is fit to speak for those who choose that label."

New York Times opinion writer Ross Douthat agreed in a March 10 article. "While more orthodox Christians have kept him at arm's length or condemned him, he's wooed televangelists and prosperity preachers, and pitched himself to believers already primed to believe that a meretricious huckster with unusual hair might be a vessel of the divine will." Jack Jenkins, writing in *ThinkProgress.org* on March 15, noted another similarity between Trump and some supporters: "Trump's pastor friends have one thing in common: they're all rich. The prosperity gospel is an American Christian movement that teaches followers they can become rich through the art of positive thinking and, more importantly, cutting large checks to their church and pastor. Joel Osteen's kind words for Trump are but the latest example of a relationship unusual for both its coziness and its reciprocity."

A number of political analysts have argued that Trump's evangelical supporters seem to be more of the "nominal" or "cultural" types who rarely or infrequently attend church services. (This is similar to those of other faith traditions.) Cruz was strong among those who are regular churchgoers and among evangelicals who want their candidate to share their religious views and values. Kasich was stronger among moderates in all religious categories, and Rubio, while still a candidate, ran strongest among young, suburban and well educated evangelicals.



Darren Patrick Guerra, professor of political science at Biola University, argued in *Christianity Today* March 18 that a majority of evangelicals did not vote for Trump, especially in Missouri, Illinois and Ohio. Guerra cites Missouri, where active churchgoers preferred Cruz 56% - 30% over Trump, while inactive churchgoers went for Trump 48% - 29% over Cruz.

This disconnect can be seen clearly at the Liberty University campus precinct in Lynchburg, Virginia, where Trump received a paltry 90 votes out of 1,200, despite their president Jerry Falwell Jr.'s endorsement.

Rubio carried the precinct 44% to 33% for Cruz and 13% for Carson. (That same precinct gave Romney 95.3% of the 2012 general election vote.)

Guerra argues that "evangelical Trump voters may 'happen' to be evangelical but they are not necessarily voting for Trump 'because' they are evangelical." He adds, "Jacksonians are largely highly nationalistic blue collar voters who despise Wall Street bankers and Washington elites. There is a long historical precedent for Jacksonian voters periodically rising up in anger and disrupting the political equilibrium, as was seen with Andrew Jackson himself, William Jennings Bryan, and to a lesser extent, Ross Perot. Most of the exit poll data suggests that evangelicals, per se, are not driving

Trump's success; Jacksonians are." These "Jacksonian voters live in blue collar southern and midwestern communities where nominal evangelicals are more likely to also reside."

University of Notre Dame professor Geoffrey Layman observed in *The Washington Post* on March 29, "A considerable literature on religion and politics suggests that evangelicals who attend worship services irregularly tend to have less formal education and lower incomes than more devout evangelicals. They tend to care less about moral and cultural issues and vote more on the basis of economic concerns. In some cases, they are less tolerant of religious and racial minority groups." He adds, "Many evangelical Christians are distressed that so many of their fellow evangelicals are backing Trump for president. Although Trump receives considerable support from devout

continued on page 5

Voice of Reason is the quarterly journal of Americans for Religious Liberty, PO Box 6656, Silver Spring, MD 20916 (telephone 301-460-1111; e-mail: arlinc@verizon.net; website: www.arlinc.org). The journal is sent to all contributors to ARL.

Senior Editor: Edd Doerr
Editor: Albert J. Menendez
Production Editor: Teri Grimwood

Americans for Religious Liberty is a nonprofit public interest educational 501(c)(3) organization dedicated to preserving the American tradition of religious, intellectual, and personal freedom in a secular democratic state. Membership is open to all who share its purposes. Annual dues are \$25 for individuals, \$35 for families, \$15 for students and limited income. Our IRS ID number is 36-3118921. Donations are tax-deductible.

Board of Directors: Burton Caine, *Chair*; Joanne Goldsmith; T. Jer-

emy Gunn; William R. Murry; Susan Nogan; David J. Nolan; Amanda Poppei; Michael Prival; V.K. Sandin.

National Advisory Board: M. David Alexander; Philip Appleman; Francisco Ayala; Rev. Charles Bergstrom; Walter Breuggeman; Rev. John Buehrens; Bob Chase; Joseph Chuman; Dr. Catherine Cohen; Denise Davidoff; Norman Dorsen; Niles Eldredge; Edward L. Ericson; Joseph Fahey; Rev. Carl Flemister; Keith Geiger; Laurie Godfrey; Morris Goodman; Frances Kissling; Rev. James Lawson; Anne W. Lindsay; Rev. Barry Lynn; James T. McCollum; Rev. O. Eugene Pickett; Alan Powell; Rosemary Ruether; Rev. William F. Schulz; Eugenie Scott; Lynn Silverberg-Master; Rev. Bruce Southworth; Rev. A. Knighton Stanley; Nadine Strossen; Philippa Strum; Ruti Teitel; Sister Margaret Traxler; Edward O. Wilson; Walter Wink.

Edd Doerr, *President*
Albert J. Menendez, *Research Director*

The Election Results, *continued from page 1*

didate was one that struck many on social media as a symbol of unity at a time of division on the campaign trail,” wrote Niraj Warikoo in the *Detroit Free Press* on March 9. Clinton carried Detroit and most of its suburbs.

Mississippi, March 8: Trump easily won the Magnolia State 47% to 36% for Cruz, and carried all but five rural counties. Evangelicals, who were 84% of GOP voters, went for Trump 48% -39% over Cruz. Democrats gave Clinton 83%, her highest victory margin in any state. The Democratic primary was unusual in that 71% of voters were black and 64% were female.

Florida, March 15: Marco Rubio’s campaign ended in an almost Shakespearean way. He was defeated on the Ides of March in his home state, surely the cruelest cut of all. Despite sweeping his home county (Miami-Dade) 3-1, he lost the remaining 66 counties, from Pensacola to Key West, to Trump.

Trump beat Rubio 46% - 27%, with Cruz taking 17% and Kasich 7%. Trump won majorities in rural areas and small towns, where Cruz ran second. Trump also won the suburbs and such cities as Tampa, Orlando, Jacksonville, and Ft. Lauderdale. He carried the Panhandle, which borders Alabama, a historic populist area, anti-Catholic, anti-black, and a 1968 stronghold of George Wallace. Large Trump majorities came in central Florida (57% in Putnam County, the state’s poorest county) and in counties populated largely by retirees from the Northeast and Midwest. Trump won by 22 points among the 48% calling themselves evangelicals, and by 17 points among the 29% who are Catholic. Rubio won heavily among his fellow Cuban-Americans.

Florida Democrats preferred Clinton by a 2-1 margin. She won all regions, and by 3-1 in Miami, Ft. Lauderdale and West Palm Beach. Clinton was supported by 79% of blacks, 72% of Hispanics and 52% of whites. Her margins were lower in Tallahassee, the state capital, liberal Key West, and the county containing the University of Florida. Nine rural white counties in North Florida went for Sanders.

Illinois, March 15: Trump beat Cruz by nine points, with Kasich running a respectable third. Trump carried Chicago and its suburbs, though Kasich ran second. Trump also won most of southern Illinois, the St. Louis suburbs, and two of the three college counties, though a third of the student area votes went for Kasich or Rubio. Cruz carried much of central Illinois, including Peoria, Springfield and Bloomington, and narrowly beat Trump by two points among evangelicals, though the Baptist counties in southern Illinois went for Trump.

Clinton carried Illinois by one point, on a wave of Chicago votes. She carried the Windy City by a margin of 55,000 votes, offsetting a Sanders victory of 21,000 in the rest of the state. Clinton also carried the Chicago suburbs, and eked out small majorities in the blue-collar St. Louis suburbs, and in Peoria and Rock Island. Sanders swept the three college counties and carried Springfield and Rockford.

Missouri, March 15: There were near ties in both parties in the “Show Me” state. Trump sneaked by Cruz by 1,726 votes, while Clinton edged out Sanders by 1,531 votes. Trump and Cruz each drew 41%. Cruz won evangelicals by 16 points and weekly churchgoers by 20 points. Cruz won a majority in Springfield and the Ozarks, bastions of religious fundamentalism.

Trump narrowly carried greater St. Louis and the eastern part of the state. Despite the evangelical majority for Cruz statewide, Trump won

evangelical votes in the four counties of the southeast called the Boot Heel, where anti-Catholic voting hurt Kennedy in 1960 and George Wallace ran strongly in 1968.

Missouri Democrats split 50-50. As in neighboring Illinois, Clinton carried the state by winning in the cities and suburbs of St. Louis and Kansas City. She won the Southeast but Sanders won heavily in conservative Springfield and in the liberal University of Missouri county.

North Carolina, March 15: The Tar Heel State, a swing state that went for Obama in 2008 and Romney in 2012, was closely watched this year. Republicans went for Trump by three points over Cruz. Trump won the Outer Banks, Charlotte, and the Republican mountain counties. Cruz won among evangelicals by two points, while Trump led among non-evangelicals, with Kasich second. Most of the western part of the state, including Asheville and Winston Salem, supported Cruz, as did the Research Triangle area around Raleigh.

Carolina Democrats went for Clinton by 14 points. She easily won the cities of Charlotte and Asheville. She carried the Research Triangle area by nine points, though Sanders squeaked ahead in the state’s most liberal county by two points (Orange County, home of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill). Sanders did well in the western part of the state, his biggest victory coming in the county where Appalachian State University is located.

Ohio, March 15: The crucial state of Ohio, without which no Republican candidate has ever won the presidency, was loyal to its Gov. John Kasich. Kasich’s 47% to 36% margin over Trump carried most demographic categories. Kasich overwhelmed Trump 3-1 in Columbus and its suburbs and almost 2-1 in Cleveland and Cincinnati. He swept central Ohio and most small cities. Trump, however, won the Appalachian regions of the state, carrying every county bordering Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Kentucky.

Ohio Democrats went for Clinton 57% to 43%, winning all the major cities. Sanders’ biggest win came in the county where Ohio University is located, and he eked out a one point margin in the county that includes Kent State University. He also carried 13 rural counties.

Wisconsin, April 5: Cruz crushed Trump 48% - 35%, with his margin of 145,000 coming mostly from Milwaukee and its suburbs, as well as the rest of eastern Wisconsin, including Green Bay. Heavily German, Dutch and Polish Catholic counties (including Green Bay) went for Cruz. Trump won rural northern and western counties and carried the Norwegian Lutheran area. Third-place finisher Kasich drew his greatest support in liberal Madison. Cruz carried Racine, Eau Claire, and other small cities. His greatest strength came in the suburbs (a 21 point margin) rather than cities (10 points) or rural areas (three points).

Evangelicals went for Cruz by 21 points, and non-evangelicals backed him by seven. Trump won the isolationist vote (those who want the U.S. to take a “less active role in world affairs”) and the pro-deportation, anti-immigrant vote.

Wisconsin Democrats gave Sanders a solid 57% - 43% victory. His geographical sweep was impressive, carrying all counties except Milwaukee. Sanders narrowly carried the Milwaukee suburbs, where Democrats are relatively few, and swept liberal Madison by 63% - 37%.

New York, April 19: Trump won 60% and carried every county, ironically except Manhattan, his home turf, which supported Kasich. Trump polled 72% on Long Island, 68% in the New York suburbs and 64% in New York City. In the Big Apple his support ranged from 82% in
continued on page 4

The Election Results, *continued from page 3*

conservative Staten Island to 42% in liberal Manhattan. He carried evangelicals and non-evangelicals.

Clinton won a 58% to 42% victory over Sanders in the state both claim as home (Clinton by choice, Sanders by birth). Her victory margin came mostly from New York City and its suburbs, especially in Westchester County, where she resides.

These margins offset Sanders' majority upstate. The Senator actually carried 54 of the state's 67 counties and did best in rural areas bordering Vermont and around Cornell University.

A religious question appeared on the Democratic exit poll, showing Clinton won 65% of Protestants, 62% of Catholics and 43% of "nones." About 12% of primary voters were Jewish but there was no breakdown for their vote. Uriel Heilman, writing in the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* on April 20, said that while there was "relatively scant concrete data" on the Jewish vote, "the heavily Jewish precincts in Borough Park, Crown Heights and Williamsburg in Brooklyn went 61-64% for Clinton. She did even better in the Upper West Side and Upper East Side of Manhattan, where many Reform Jews live.... On the Republican side, Ted Cruz seems to have swept the Haredi Orthodox vote in the same Brooklyn neighborhoods that Clinton carried.

Connecticut, April 26: Clinton edged Sanders by six points, with her statewide margin coming mostly from the New York City suburb of Fairfield County. Clinton carried New Haven and Hartford, while Sanders carried the five more rural counties.

Clinton won top-heavy majorities in Bloomfield, Hartford City, and Bridgeport, largely black and Hispanic towns. In six towns which have some of the highest incomes anywhere in the U.S., Clinton won nearly 70%.

Sanders swept rural and small-town areas of the state, and won by 2 to 1 in Mansfield, home of the University of Connecticut.

Connecticut gave Trump 58% and he carried every county with a majority.

Trump piled up large majorities in working class small towns (Derby, East Haven, Sterling) and rural areas. The six wealthiest towns in Fairfield County ended in a dead heat, with Trump and Kasich each receiving 46%. Trump did even better among evangelicals than non-evangelicals.

Evangelicals and the Republican Vote

State	% Evangelical	Evan. Winner	Non-Evan. Winner
Connecticut	21	Trump	Trump
Florida	48	Trump	Trump
Illinois	45	Cruz	Trump
Indiana	60	Trump	Trump
Maryland	42	Trump	Trump
Michigan	54	Trump	Trump
Mississippi	84	Trump	Trump
Missouri	60	Cruz	Trump
New York	27	Trump	Trump
North Carolina	69	Cruz	Trump
Ohio	51	Kasich	Kasich
Pennsylvania	45	Trump	Trump
Wisconsin	42	Cruz	Cruz

Delaware, April 26: Clinton and Trump both won about 60% of their respective primaries. Clinton's support was uniform in all the counties. Trump rolled to victory with 61%. His support reached 71% in Sussex County, which resembles (and borders) Maryland's Eastern Shore, and is the state's most Republican county. But he won only 51% in the Wilmington metro area.

Maryland, April 26: Clinton easily carried Maryland by almost two to one, winning 3-1 in black majority Prince Georges County and 2-1 in neighboring Montgomery County, both suburbs of the nation's capital. She won 2-1 in Baltimore and about 60% in suburban and exurban Maryland. Sanders carried three Republican strongholds where there are few Democrats, two in far western Maryland bordering West Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the other a Baltimore exurb. Blacks outnumbered whites (46% - 43%) among Democratic primary voters. Clinton took 75% of blacks and 52% of whites.

While Trump carried every county, and the state with 54%, his support ranged from 73% in the resort area around Ocean City to only about 40% in the high-income D.C. suburbs of Montgomery and Howard Counties.

Trump swept the Eastern Shore, once a moderate Republican area, and the GOP mountains in the west. The tycoon took 70% in the Eastern Shore counties of Dorchester and Somerset, which were hotbeds of support for George Wallace in 1968. Evangelicals and non-evangelicals both gave Trump a majority.

Pennsylvania, April 26: Clinton won the Keystone State 56% - 44% by carrying traditionally Democratic Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, as well as smaller cities (Erie, Harrisburg, Scranton, Allentown). She won easily in the Philadelphia suburbs. Sanders carried most of rural Pennsylvania, the traditional "T" counties from the northern border with New York to the central region, all Republican strongholds in November. The Republican "Pennsylvania Dutch" region split, with Clinton carrying York by three points and Sanders winning Lancaster by the same margin.

Trump's landslide (57%) swept every county, with his support varying widely from 77% around Wilkes-Barre to 44% in Lancaster, the heart of Amish Country, with its large numbers of Mennonites and Lutherans.

Kasich ran strongest in the state's two wealthiest counties, and in Pittsburgh. Cruz ran strongest in Lancaster and in rural Pennsylvania. Evangelicals and non-evangelicals both gave Trump a majority of their votes. Trump did well in the economically depressed northeastern part of the state, around Scranton, and in the Poconos Mountain region, a resort area with many migrants.

Rhode Island, April 26: Democratic Rhode Island supported Sanders over Clinton by 12 points. He carried all five counties, and his vote topped 60% in many rural towns and 52% in the city of Providence. Clinton won 59% in Central Falls, the poorest town, where Obama won 87% against Romney.

Trump swept 64%, carrying 45 of the state's 46 towns. He ran strongest in working-class areas such as French Catholic Woonsocket and Pawtucket, though most votes in those towns were cast in the Democratic primary, and where voters supported Obama 3-1 in 2012.

Indiana, May 3: Trump carried 87 of the state's 92 counties, losing to Cruz only in Fort Wayne and four neighboring rural counties in the northeast corner.

continued on page 9

A Summing Up

Exit polls from 27 state primaries show a number of stunning consistencies, all of which may affect the November election.

National turnout through the May 3 Indiana primary showed more than 25 million Republicans and 22 million Democrats voting. Trump claimed victory but only won 41% of the vote in contested primaries: Trump 10.7 million votes, Cruz 7.3, Kasich 3.8, Rubio 3.5, and about a half million for others. Clinton led Sanders 12.4 million to 9.2 million, with a number of primaries, including California and New Jersey, still to come.

Democrats

1. The gender gap among Democrats is real. Clinton ran stronger among Democratic women than Democratic men in every state. The gender gap reached 17 points in Arkansas and 16 in Massachusetts, but only 3 points in West Virginia.
2. The age gap was similarly astounding. Clinton won the above 65 vote and Sanders won the under-30 vote in almost every state.
3. Clinton swept the African-American vote in every state, reaching 91% in Alabama.
4. In exit polls that asked about church attendance, Clinton won among the frequent attendees, while Sanders won among voters who attend rarely or never.
5. Hispanic voters favored Clinton by 2 to 1 or more in Texas, New York and Florida. She also carried Hispanic-majority counties in Arizona and Colorado.
6. Self-identified Democrats supported Clinton, while independents favored Sanders in almost every state.



Republicans

1. There was a GOP version of the gender gap. Trump ran stronger among Republican men than women in every state but Wisconsin, where there was no gender difference.
2. In the 27 GOP primaries with exit polls, Trump won evangelicals in 18, Cruz in eight, and Kasich in one. NBC News number crunchers concluded that Trump won 40% of evangelicals, Cruz 34%, Rubio 11% and Kasich 10%.
3. Trump generally ran strongest among non-college educated and lower income white voters.
4. Trump was the favored candidate among voters who support deportation of undocumented immigrants and those who support a temporary ban on Muslims entering the U.S. However, Republican voters in most states opposed the idea of deportation rather than a process toward legal status.

The gender gap is changing the configuration of both parties. A majority of voters in all Democratic primaries were women, including 64% in Mississippi. In two-thirds of Republican primaries, most voters were men, especially in Connecticut and New York. Six states were evenly divided by gender, while GOP women outnumbered men in only Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina.

—Al Menendez

Battles for the Religious Blocs, *Continued from page 2*

evangelicals, his base is among the less devout. It's these evangelicals who best fit the demographic profile of Trump's supporters and are more attracted by the blend of economic populism, racial antipathy and anti-Muslim rhetoric that has defined the Trump campaign."

Staff writer Elizabeth Bruenig at the *New Republic* wrote just before Super Tuesday about "evangelical voters' relative ambivalence toward Ted Cruz." She noted, "From the outset of the race, the senator from Texas has positioned himself as an evangelical-friendly candidate, emphasizing his religious upbringing (vis-à-vis his pastor father Rafael Cruz) and rolling out the harsh rhetoric on classic culture-war issues like same-sex marriage and abortion. Cruz's push for evangelical votes was more than a perfunctory shout-out to an important Republican base: Inspiring vast, energetic evangelical support was a key strategy for the Cruz campaign." Cruz delivered "sermons from the stump," hoping for a huge evangelical vote. But that did not materialize, because "evangelicals differ not only in their politics but in their religiosity." As a result, Bruenig concludes: "The old-fashioned model of reaching evangelicals no longer appears functional, and Republican

politicians will have to re-evaluate their strategies for reaching and inspiring the party's biggest religious voting bloc."

As it turned out, Trump won the evangelical vote in most of the primaries.

Catholics

The large bloc of Catholic voters, diverse and powerful in many states, has been virtually ignored by exit polls. They popped up in Massachusetts and Florida Republican polls, giving about half to

continued on page 6

Attention ARL Supporters

Would you prefer to receive ARL's *Voice of Reason* journal by email in PDF format? It would get the journal to you more quickly and would save ARL money. If you would like to receive the journal by email, please send ARL your email address at arlinc@verizon.net, as well as your name and postal address. Thank you.

Battles for the Religious Blocs, *Continued from page 5*

Trump, or the same level of support as other voters. (Hispanic Catholics are an exception.) Trump did carry some heavily Catholic counties in Massachusetts, Michigan, Louisiana, and Pennsylvania, but Cruz won in Wisconsin.

There are more Catholic Democrats than Catholic Republicans, but exit polls ignored religion in the Democratic polls. Clinton seems to have carried Catholic strongholds in Massachusetts, Florida, New York, and Michigan. A Pew poll released April 1 showed Catholic Democrats favoring Clinton 59% - 33% over Sanders.

Catholics are the classic swing voters and have had the uncanny ability to support the winning candidate in at least 16 of the past 21 elections, beginning with FDR in 1932. Twice they were split even (1956, 1988) and only three times did they support the loser (Stevenson in 1952, Humphrey in 1968 and Gore in 2000). The Catholic vote has been within one or two points of the national vote in the past four elections.

Jews

Jewish voters amount to about 2% of all and tend to be concentrated in New York, New Jersey and Florida. Jews have long supported Democratic presidential candidates. Only Jimmy Carter in 1980 failed to win a majority. Jews prefer Democrats 64% - 26%, according to Pew, and Obama beat Romney 69% - 30% in 2012. The Romney vote, however, was the highest Jewish Republican vote since George H.W. Bush in 1988.

This year Jewish voters have received a great deal of attention because Bernie Sanders is a serious contender for the Democratic nomination. That fact has not produced an avalanche of voters for the Vermont senator. Julie Zauzmer cautioned in *The Washington Post* March 8: "But all that talk doesn't appear to be translating into extra votes. Sanders has already come closer to the White House than any Jew in history, seemingly without inspiring Jews to be any more likely to vote for him than non-Jewish Americans with similar demographics."

Sanders also has few ties to Jewish religious life, being essentially secular. In one Democratic debate, he responded, "I am very proud of being Jewish, and that is an essential part of who I am as a human being." Zauzmer also noted, "Sanders is also up against an opponent with deep ties to the Jewish community. The Clintons have long enjoyed the support of many Jewish voters, including some significant donors."

"There are obvious constitutional difficulties with trying to provide tax monies for religious schools. Even if that aspect could be resolved, there still will be major difficulties with taxpayers who are philosophically opposed to financial assistance to religious schools. It is significant that with one exception in 1954, Californians have consistently voted in favor of separation of church and state."

— Ronald Reagan
Governor of California, 1970

Note: California voters in 1982, 1970 and 2000 referenda voted against tax aid to private schools by an average margin of 67% to 33%.

Jewish voters are also diverse. Only 12% of secular Jews are Republicans, compared to 57% of Orthodox Jews. Romney won 70% or more in Orthodox towns in New Jersey and New York in 2012.

There have been too few Jewish voters in this year's primaries to draw many conclusions about Jewish preferences. But Clinton carried the most Jewish cities in Massachusetts, Brookline and Sharon, and received 73% in Broward County, Florida, a Jewish stronghold.

Jewish Republicans are increasingly disinclined to support Trump. Jonathan Mahler noted in *The New York Times* March 20: "Mr. Trump's ostentatious disregard for the sensitivities of various religious and ethnic groups has hit a nerve among Jewish organizations, inspiring a barrage of denunciations from across the ideological spectrum." His shifting views on Israel and on various social issues led to cool receptions when he spoke before AIPAC, the pro-Israel lobby, and the Republican Jewish Coalition. William Kristol, the Jewish editor of the conservative *Weekly Standard*, has roundly criticized Trump, though casino magnate Sheldon Adelson said he would support Trump if he wins the nomination. Orthodox Jews in Brooklyn voted for Cruz, according to an analysis by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

The "Nones"

The religiously unaffiliated quarter of the population (but less than one fifth of voters) are a strong component of the new Democratic coalition, which used to be heavily Catholic and Baptist. But they are perhaps more diverse than any other group, ranging from the atheist, agnostic and humanist camp to the much larger group of searchers and indifferent. Largely young, male, and single, their voter turnout is among the lowest, thereby reducing their clout.

The nones favor the Democrats by a wide margin. They were not included in any of the exit polls, though some polls mentioned church attendance. The "never" attendees favored Sanders in the Democratic race, and Trump in the Republican primaries. Young, single males generally favored Sanders.

A new Pew survey released on April 1 showed Sanders crushing Clinton 68% - 32% among the nones, who are 32% of Democratic respondents. Among nonaffiliated Republicans (13% of all) Trump swamps Cruz and Kasich, with 57% to 17% for each of his rivals.

Mark Silk, director of the Center for the Study of Religion in Public Life at Trinity College, wrote in RNS on April 1 that the nones are drawn to the least religious candidate in each party, "Donald Trump, the not-very-religious Presbyterian, and Bernie Sanders, the secular Jew."

Silk adds, "The biggest story in American religion over the past decade has been the rise of the Nones, and Pew's new findings suggest that they're still rising, doubling their proportion of Republican voters since the 2012 election and increasing from a quarter to a third their share of the Democrats. It's fair to say that, for the first time in American history, the Nones are making their influence felt on the presidential nominating process."

Mormons

The staunchly Republican (80%) Mormon community can usually be counted upon to keep Utah and Idaho in the GOP fold. But Trump's extremely poor showing (10% or less) among Mormons may put those two states in play for the first time since 1964, the last time they voted Democratic for president. A Mormon defection if Trump is the nominee could also put Arizona in play. Matt Miles, a political scientist at Mormon-related Brigham Young University, told the *Salt Lake Tribune* March 16: "You have a group who cares more about politics than the

church, those Mormons tend to be Trump supporters. For those religion-first Mormons, they won't support Trump. They'll say he had too many divorces, and they don't see him as a strong moral leader."

Mormon voters were disenchanted by the Trump campaign. *Washington Post* reporter Katie Zezima said on the eve of the Utah election: "Trump's proposal to bar Muslims from entering the United States has particularly troubled many Mormons, whose founders fled west to practice their faith and who value religious liberty."

Mormon celebrities like Glenn Beck and Mitt Romney endorsed Cruz and targeted Provo, home of Brigham Young University (BYU). The college town and surrounding county gave Trump a paltry 9%, while Cruz swept 76% and Kasich 15%. (At Brigham Young's Idaho campus, only 8% supported Trump.) Cruz won all 40 Utah delegates as a result.

The *Deseret News* reported on March 20 the results of a statewide poll showing: "If Donald Trump becomes the Republican Party's nominee, Utahans would vote for a Democrat for president in November for the first time in more than 50 years."

Chris Karpowitz, co-director of BYU's Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy, warned that if the GOP nominates Trump "they may have trouble, serious trouble, in reliably Republican states like Utah." Former Utah Gov. Mike Leavitt added, "If you lose Utah as a Republican, there is no hope."

If there is a Mormon defection from the GOP, this will affect several western states.

Muslims

Muslims, at three million strong, are about 1% of the national vote, but could be a factor in close races in Michigan, Virginia, New Jersey, and Florida. The constant attacks on them by both Trump and Cruz have alienated most. *New York Times* reporter Alan Rappeport wrote on March 25: "American Muslims are watching in growing horror as Donald J. Trump and Senator Ted Cruz battle for the Republican presidential nomination, outdoing each other with provocative proposals that have included Muslim registries, immigration bans and fleets of police patrolling their neighborhoods."

This has wiped out any Republican support, even among pro-business and religiously conservative Muslims. Rappeport added, "Muslims tended to lean Republican as recently as 2000, but a backlash after the September 11, 2001, attacks, along with the Middle East policies of the George W. Bush administration, has led to a gradual shift toward the Democrats. A Pew Research Center survey last year found that 70% of American Muslims identify with the Democratic Party, while just 11% consider themselves to be Republicans."

As a consequence, Muslim organizations are holding voter education workshops, particularly in Virginia and Florida, where Muslim voter registration is up 20%. Muslim voters around Dearborn, Michigan, voted heavily (63%) for Sanders. ■

Who Voted for Trump?

There is a new phenomenon in American politics: The rise of authoritarianism among voters, and a candidate who symbolizes and promotes the fear, anger and distrust associated with this movement.

It's not really new, of course. American politics has seen similar tendencies in the George Wallace campaign in 1968 and some fringe candidates before his "Stand Up for America" combination of racism and populism. But now it's the "Make America Great Again" by a billionaire businessman who has never been elected to public office but has become the presumptive nominee of the Republican Party.

Political scientists and religion scholars have taken notice of this disturbing trend. Amanda Taub, writing in *Vox.com* on March 1, said, "Donald Trump could be just the first of many Trumps in American politics. Trump is just the symptom. The rise of American authoritarianism is transforming the Republican Party and the dynamics of national politics, with profound consequences likely to extend well beyond this election."

NYU Professor Jonathan Haidt wrote that authoritarianism is another word for right-wing populism. "In case of moral threat, lock down the borders, kick out those who are different, and punish those who are morally deviant."

Matthew MacWilliams, of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, polled a large sample of likely voters and found that their authoritarian sentiments "not only correlated with support for Trump but seemed to predict support for Trump more reliably than virtually any other indicator." His psychological profile of individual voters

found that authoritarianism "is characterized by a desire for order and a fear of outsiders. People who score high in authoritarianism, when they feel threatened, look for strong leaders who promise to take whatever action necessary to protect them from outsiders and prevent the changes they fear."

An analysis by Jonathan Weiler of the University of North Carolina and Marc Hetherington of Vanderbilt University concluded that the GOP "by positioning itself as the party of traditional values and law and order, had unknowingly attracted what would turn out to be a vast and previously bipartisan population of Americans with authoritarian tendencies."

These studies convinced journalist Amanda Taub. "This trend had been accelerated in recent years by demographic and economic changes such as immigration, which activated authoritarian tendencies, leading many Americans to seek out a strongman leader who would preserve a status quo they feel is under threat and impose order on a world they perceive as increasingly alien. Trump embodies the classic authoritarian leadership style: simple, powerful, and punitive."

Closely linked to authoritarian populism is Nativism, a prejudicial movement that recurs in U.S. politics, from the 1850s onward. It is the belief that only native-born white Protestants should be granted full citizenship and equal rights, and that all other religious, racial, and ethnic minorities should be treated as second-class citizens. Largely a rural, small town movement of resentful working class whites, it has

continued on page 8



Who Voted for Trump? continued from page 7

come to the fore again in an era of significant demographic change that threatens, in their view, to change American culture for the worse.

Donald Trump has clearly appealed to voters in regions where this sentiment is long standing and widespread. It includes eastern Kentucky and Tennessee, western Virginia, north Georgia and Arkansas. He received endorsements from Alabama Sen. Jeff Sessions, the leader of the anti-immigration caucus in Congress, Phoenix Sheriff Joe Arpaio, and Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach, who championed a stringent voter suppression law clearly aimed at minority voters. (Then there was the apparent endorsement of Trump by David Duke, for three decades a Ku Klux Klan and neo-Nazi luminary.)

It is not surprising that liberals, progressives and moderates oppose his election. But leading conservatives, journalists, intellectuals, and religious leaders fear and reject his candidacy. He has been called everything from “simpleton” to “pathological liar” by Charles Krauthammer, Michael Gerson, George Will, David Brooks, and Russell Moore, among other conservatives.

Mark Tooley, leader of a conservative think tank, the Institute on Religion and Democracy, wrote in the *Christian Post*: “Trump is maybe the most dangerous demagogue ever seriously to seek the presidency, and his unprecedented approach contravenes traditional American democratic norms and any serious Christian political witness.”

Christian Post added in its first-ever political editorial on February 29: “Donald Trump does not represent the interests of evangelicals and would be a dangerous leader for our country. This is a critical time in American history. It is not the time for Donald Trump.”

A group of Catholic conservatives, including Robert George, George Weigel, and Nina Shea, published a letter in the conservative *National Review* on March 7: “His campaign has already driven our politics down to new levels of vulgarity. His appeals to racial and ethnic fears and prejudice are offensive to any genuinely Catholic sensibility.” They added that the Trump campaign “promises only the further degradation of our politics and our culture.” They concluded that there are other candidates “far more likely than Mr. Trump to address serious concerns but “who do not exhibit his vulgarity, oafishness, shocking ignorance, and – we do not hesitate to use the word – demagoguery.”

The respected, middle-of-the-road weekly, *The Economist*, opined on February 27: “Mr. Trump has prospered by inciting hatred and violence. He is so unpredictable that the thought of him anywhere near high office is terrifying. He must be stopped...” The same journal editorialized sadly on May 7, “Trump’s triumph is a tragedy for America and the world.”

Neil Irwin and Josh Katz, writing in *The New York Times* on March 12, found their analysis of “hundreds of demographic and economic variables from census data show that Trump counties are places where

white identity mixes with long-simmering economic dysfunctions.” The “strongest predictor of Trump support was the high proportion of whites without a high school diploma.” Other factors include “a high proportion of working-age adults who aren’t working.”

Another predictor of Trump support “is the proportion of the population that is native born.” They add, “Relatively few people in the places where Trump is strong are immigrants” and the native-born residents are more likely to call themselves “American” than English, German, or Irish. Since few (or none) are Native Americans, these are people who refuse to acknowledge their ancestry. Trump has also done well in counties that gave George Wallace strong support in 1968.

Brookings Institution demographer William Frey concurs. “It’s a nonurban, blue-collar and now apparently quite angry population. They’re not people who have moved around a lot, and things have been changing away from them, but they live in areas that feel stagnant in a lot of ways.”

Robert David Sullivan, writing in *America* magazine on March 28, says that “Trump has generally done well in population-loss counties, and in counties where newcomers from elsewhere in the United States far outnumber immigrants.” These places, such as Phoenix, Fort Myers, and Myrtle Beach, are areas “whose population booms are largely fueled by people moving away from counties where the foreign-born make up an increasingly large share of the population”

It is not surprising that liberals, progressives and moderates oppose his election. But leading conservatives, journalists, intellectuals, and religious leaders fear and reject his candidacy.

In addition, “Trump has shown a pattern of doing better the farther he gets from a state’s population center and from the capital.” (This was also true for Ross Perot in 1992.)

Sullivan also found Trump has shown unusual strength in Appalachia, a large white Scotch-Irish rural and isolated area where populism was historically strong. “Outside of the Maine caucuses, he’s won every state that includes even a tiny piece of the Appalachian mountain range.”

Writing before Trump secured the nomination, historian Charles Postel of San Francisco State University concluded, “The GOP has steadily evolved in the direction of a conservative party steeped in Christian nationalism.” Citing the party’s stealthy use of anti-Catholic bias in the past, he warned, “The politics of the 2016 election cycle are as unpredictable as they are potentially explosive. The Democratic side is offering a candidate that is committed to a liberal Christianity with deep roots in America’s political tradition. This is a tradition that has placed value on fellowship across religious and sectarian divides. This commitment will be put to the test in coming political trials. The other Democratic candidate’s lack of religion also has deep historical roots, but his competitive bid for the White House is crossing into uncharted political territory. Meanwhile, the GOP is fielding the most spiritually diverse group of presidential candidates in its history. At the same time, these candidates are appealing to religious paranoia and intolerance in ways that are both familiar and unknown. The GOP may relearn the lessons of 1884 about the hazards of embracing bigots. Or it may forge ahead down the perilous path of sectarian intolerance. The only thing certain is that the GOP candidates are playing with fire.” ■

Back Issues of *Voice of Reason*

Since 1982 Americans for Religious Liberty has published 135 issues of its journal, the *Voice of Reason*. All of these issues are now available in downloadable PDF format at our website, www.arlinc.org.

If for any reason you should need an original printed version, these are also available from Americans for Religious Liberty at:

ARL, PO Box 6656
Silver Spring, MD 20916

Contraceptive Conflict May Be Headed to Resolution

The U.S. Supreme Court took the unusual step of vacating the decisions of five appeals courts that dealt with religious accommodations to contraceptive insurance coverage by religious nonprofits. On May 16 an unsigned, unanimous decision sent the cases back in *Zubik v. Burwell*, suggesting that a compromise was possible.

Four appeals courts had ruled that the Obama administration's original compromise, allowing religiously affiliated nonprofit groups to opt out of providing birth control coverage in their insurance plans by notifying the government, was reasonable. One appeals court concluded that the accommodation still violated the religious convictions of groups that considered any involvement as complicit with evil.

After contentious March 23 oral testimony, the justices asked interested parties that had filed briefs in the case to submit additional briefs outlining potential compromises, an unprecedented development that "turned the justices into policymakers," wrote Richard Wolf in *USA Today*, March 30.

In the May decision the court ruled that "nothing in this opinion, or in the opinions or orders of the courts below, is to affect the ability of the government to ensure that women covered by petitioners' health plans obtain, without cost, the full range of FDA-approved contraceptives."

President Obama seemed to accept the court's reasoning. The "practical effect is right now, women will still be able to get contraception if they are getting health insurance."

Some groups expressed concern that the Court sidestepped the legal issue at the heart of the controversy. The Court ruled that it "does not decide whether petitioners' religious exercise has been substantially burdened, whether the Government has a compelling interest, or

whether the current regulations are the least restrictive means of serving that interest."

Apparently, the appeals courts will have to reach agreements with the government in the near future that protects women's free access to contraceptive health care while respecting the objections of those dissenting religious groups.

This case received unparalleled attention, as 69 briefs were filed on one side or the other, and 330 members of Congress signed on to various briefs. The May 16 decision apparently resulted from a sharply divided court that did not wish to issue a 4-4 ruling. ■

The Election Results, *continued from page 4*

Trump trounced Cruz by 37 points in Gary, and by 10 points in Indianapolis, and 7 points in wealthy Hamilton County, an Indianapolis suburb. He swept the rural counties in southern Indiana and even carried the counties including Indiana University and Purdue University by small margins. Cruz carried Elkhart County, a strongly Mennonite area. Trump won both evangelicals and non-evangelicals. Cruz and Kasich ended their campaigns after their Hoosier State defeats.

Sanders beat Clinton 53% - 47%, and carried a majority of counties, except Gary, and some rural counties mostly in the southeast, bordering Ohio and Kentucky, which went for Clinton. Sanders edged out Clinton 51% - 49% in Indianapolis, while rural and small town areas supported the senator. Sanders won 2-1 in the Indiana University area and 3-2 around Purdue University. ■



Church and State in the Courts

The teaching of evolution in science classes received a boost on April 19 when the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit rejected a claim from a Kansas group calling itself Citizens for Objective Public Education (COPE) that new standards for science teaching constituted "anti-religious instruction." A federal district court had dismissed the plaintiffs for lack of standing, and the Tenth Circuit agreed.

The appeals court went further, specifically rejecting the charge that the science standards adopted by a Kansas Board of Education in 2013 had "communicated a religious symbol or message" resulting in an "establishment of a non-religious worldview in the guise of science education." The appeals court firmly rejected "all theories of injury" and said there was no "personal injury" since the standards are "guideposts" agreed upon by educators and scientists. "COPE does not offer any facts to support the conclusion that the standards condemn any religion or send a message of endorsement."



The U.S. Army cannot subject a Sikh soldier to tests that could prohibit his military service, a federal judge ruled on March 4. U.S. District Judge Beryl Howell of the Federal District Court for Washing-

ton, D.C. ruled that the Army must cease "any non-standard or discriminatory testing" for Captain Simratpal Singh, who wears a turban and beard. Howell wrote that the army must approve "requests for accommodation of religious practices unless accommodation will have an adverse impact on unit readiness, individual readiness, unit cohesion, morale, good order, discipline, safety, and/or health."

She issued a restraining order after concluding that special testing was "due only to his Sikh articles of faith and was unfair and discriminatory" and showed "a clear tendency" to discourage the military participation of other Sikhs. Captain Singh had received a Bronze Star for his service in Afghanistan.

New York Times reporter Dave Philipps noted that "Religious accommodations for uniforms have remained rare. Only three Sikhs, two Muslims, and a rabbi have been granted accommodations in the Army since 2009."

The Army agreed to modify its rules on March 31. Debra Wada, assistant secretary of the Army, announced that the service branch will "gather information to develop uniform standards for religious accommodation." Sikh Coalition Legal Director Harsimran Kaur responded, "This decision gives hope that our nation's largest employer is

continued on page 10

Church and State in the Courts, cont. from p. 9

making progress towards ending a policy of religious discrimination.”



A civil trial verdict found that two cities dominated by a breakaway fundamentalist Mormon sect violated the rights of other citizens by denying them water service and delaying police response to emergencies.

The seven-week trial ended on March 7. The *Los Angeles Times* on March 8 reported the outcome: “The verdict in the civil trial could have far-reaching implications for the twin towns of Hildale, Utah, and Colorado City, Arizona. Each is run by members of the Fundamental Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and though town leaders had pledged improvements, trial evidence suggested they simply modernized their exclusionary practices instead.”

The U.S. Justice Department intervened in the case, supporting the plaintiffs, and a federal judge, U.S. District Judge Russell Holland, will attempt to end the theocracy. The sect running the twin border cities is linked to Warren Jeffs, now imprisoned for life for child sexual assault.

The *Los Angeles Times* noted, “Today, Hildale and Colorado City operate as independent municipalities, each with a mayor and five-

member town council, though most of the land in each is held by the United Effort Plan Trust, a sect-controlled fiduciary collective.” The paper also said that “rarely has an entire city – including the mayor’s office – been the possible subject of federal oversight and management.”



A federal judge granted a preliminary injunction on March 31, barring Mississippi from preventing same sex couples from adopting children. U.S. District Judge Daniel Jordan said the law violates the Constitution’s equal protection clause.



Texas prisons must allow Muslim inmates to wear longer beards and skullcaps, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled on May 2. A unanimous three-judge panel held that Texas prison policy restricting beards and religious headgear violates a 2015 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in a similar case from Arkansas. The appeals court said that the ban was not the “least restrictive” means of satisfying security concerns, and that the free exercise rights of inmates was a constitutional requirement. ■



Voucher Watch

• Christopher Lubienski, a professor in the College of Education at the University of Illinois, writes that “a slew of new studies and reviews shows that the impact on the test scores for students using vouchers are sporadic and inconsistent and have an effect on achievement that is statistically indistinguishable from zero.”

Lubienski, author of *The Public School Advantage: Why Public Schools Outperform Private Schools* (reviewed in VOR, issue 126), adds: “These new findings are a direct contradiction to the frequent claim that no student has been shown to be harmed by vouchers. This raises an ethical issue. If vouchers have been an ‘experiment,’ and randomized trials modeled after medical trials are showing evidence of harm, should policymakers end the experiment, as would be the case in medical research?”

He notes that pro-voucher advocates ignore key points in education research. “In fact, there is much evidence to suggest that improvements in student learning may have less to do with the type of school, but instead depend largely on the types of students served by a school. That is, vouchers sort students into more academically inclined groups by sending successful applicants to private schools, where they enjoy a beneficial ‘peer effect’ of more affluent classmates, but not necessarily better teaching.”

Finally, he warns that voucher supporters are likely to try new and unpersuasive methods of research. “Regardless, now that voucher advocates are facing evidence challenging their claim that vouchers for private schools boost student performance, expect to see a further retreat from the test score measures they had been embracing to promote their claim on private school effectiveness. Instead, voucher proponents will move the goalposts and ask us to pay attention to other measures,

such as persistence or parental satisfaction. The problem is, those alternative measures are also problematic and susceptible to peer effects, as time will tell.”

• A new study by education researchers concluded that the Louisiana voucher program, called the Louisiana Scholarship Program (LSP), “had a negative impact on participating students’ academic achievement in the first two years of its operation, most clearly in math... We find no evidence that the LSP has impacted students’ non-academic skills, such as conscientiousness.” Their findings contradict the propaganda of voucher supporters. “Most striking, we find strong and consistent evidence that students using an LSP scholarship performed significantly worse in math after using their scholarship to attend private schools.”

In addition, “Less than one-third of the private schools in Louisiana chose to participate in the LSP in its first year, possibly because of the extensive regulations placed on the program by the state combined with the relatively modest voucher value relative to private school tuition.”

The researchers, Jonathan Mills, Anna Egalite, and Patrick Wolf, published their conclusions on behalf of the Education Research Alliance for New Orleans on February 22. The Alliance is associated with Tulane University.

• Steadily increasing public funding for private schools through vouchers has led to greater racial segregation. This is a primary conclusion reached by the Southern Education Foundation (SEF), a research and advocacy group based in Atlanta and founded in 1867.

Using data from the National Center for Education Statistics from 1998 and 2012, the study found that private schools “remain segregated, with white students significantly overrepresented as compared to public school populations.”

“Voucher and neo-voucher tax credit scholarship programs do not offer better or more opportunities to students of color and low-income students,” said SEF president Kent McGuire, who added, “In reality, it perpetuates a trend of financially supporting private schools that as a whole remain overwhelming white – no less than 75 percent of all white students in private schools attend schools where 90 percent or more of the student body is white. As segregation persists in private schools, the demographics of public schools shift toward an increasingly diverse student body – fertile ground for the reemergence of a ‘separate but unequal’ education system.”

The report, “Race & Ethnicity in a New Era of Public Funding of Private Schools: Private School Enrollment in the South and the Nation,” concludes: “Currently 19 states have programs that provide public funding to support children’s attendance in private schools. Last year alone, approximately \$1 billion was diverted to private schools from state treasuries across the country, spreading thinner already limited resources. Though such state initiatives exist in each region of the nation, they are especially concentrated in the South.”

The study urges an end to public funding of private schools. “Now more than ever, our scarce public resources should be used to invest in public schools that operate under an obligation to serve any and all students.”

- “School Choice” programs such as voucher schools and charter schools do not advance racial integration nor do they provide a greater level of educational achievement. These are among the findings of researchers at the National Education Policy Center of the University of Colorado.

The report issued in March found that “the overall body of the research literature documents an unsettling degree of segregation – particularly in charter schools – by race and ethnicity, as well as by poverty, special needs and English-learner status.”

The researchers, William Mathis and Kevin Welner, cite studies showing that only 4.4% of charter school students are “dual language learners” (DLL), whose first language is not English, while 11% of traditional public school students are DLLs. Students with varied disabilities represent 11% to 13% of public school pupils compared to 7% – 8% of charter school pupils. Racial, ethnic and income differences are wide and “choice schools report a general pattern of increased racial isolation and growth of the achievement gap.”

Parental income is also a factor. “Parents with greater formal education and who are more affluent are more adept at maneuvering within the choice system. Because wealth and education are so strongly correlated with race, ethnicity and English-learner status, all of these forms of stratification are facilitated and exacerbated by choice. These more advantaged families are able to tap into social networks, to provide transportation, and to provide the ancillary financial and parental supports sometimes required by choice schools.”

The overall conclusion is strongly worded: “To be sure, there are outstanding choice schools and substandard choice schools. Yet choice was marketed to policymakers as a breakthrough strategy for innovation and for high achievement. As a group, they have neither proven to be innovative hotbeds nor delivered on high achievement. . . . Most troubling is the side effect of contributing to and advancing the resegregation of schools and society. This raises the specter of separate and unequal educational opportunities and is not compatible with the goals of a democratic society.”

Policy makers are encouraged to adopt laws on school choice that are “contingent on law and policies that result in equal opportunities for all” and include “constraints on stratification caused by unlimited choice.” Finally, “For all choice plans, viable choices must be available,

practical and convenient for a community’s least advantaged families.”

- Montana enacted an income tax credit program last year, worth \$150, allowing the funds to be used for private schools. The program is administered by the state Department of Revenue, which collects the funds and writes the administrative rules that dictate which schools can receive the money. The department excluded religiously affiliated schools because the state constitution prohibits “any direct or indirect appropriations or payment” from the government to religious institutions or religiously affiliated schools.

Three parents, whose children attend Stillwater Christian School, filed suit in December to gain access to the funds.

On April 1 Flathead County District Court Judge David Ortley granted their request for an injunction, holding that a tax credit is not an appropriation and can therefore include religious schools.

According to Holly Michels, in the *Independent Record* (Helena) on April 11: “The department said that its premise for administering the rules is still the same, and believes the Constitution prohibits direct or indirect payments or appropriation to religious or sectarian schools.”

The department has 45 days to respond to the ruling and may appeal on constitutional grounds. Montana Education Association president Eric Feaver predicts an appeal because a “tax credit results in a reduction in the state’s revenue stream, making it equivalent to an appropriation.” Montana citizens “should not support sectarian schools at the expense of public schools,” he added.

Latest figures show 144,532 students are enrolled in Montana public schools compared to 8,119 in private schools.

- Maryland’s heavily Democratic legislature approved \$5 million for a new voucher program for private schools. (Maryland voters twice rejected similar programs in the 1970s.) Legislators had rejected a tax credit program for ten years. Unlike many other states, Maryland’s program requires administration by the state education department. Participating schools must test students and must not allow discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin or sexual orientation. However, in a glaring omission, discrimination by religion is not prohibited, unsurprising since the vast majority of voucher-funded schools are church related.

- Diane Ravitch, in her blog on April 15, refers to vouchers for children with disabilities “as the camel’s nose under the tent, to get the movement started.” She continued, “Mississippi just passed legislation to establish vouchers for children with special needs and to permit more charters. The ‘vouchers for children with special needs’ is a first step towards a broader voucher plan that grows to include low-income children; then to include children in schools that have low test scores; then to include more and more children, until everyone gets a voucher. The not-so-subtle joke is that the voucher is not large enough to pay the tuition at a first-rate private school, so most of the children will have a voucher to go to a religious school whose teachers are uncertified and whose resources are meager.”

- The U.S. House Oversight and Government Reform Committee approved reauthorization of the D.C. voucher program (HR 4901) on April 14. The approval was by “voice” vote. ARL and over fifty other civic, religious and educational groups were opposed. The full house approved D.C. vouchers by 224 to 181 on April 29. It was nearly a party-line vote. Only two Democrats voted yes and eight Republicans voted no.

- South Dakota approved a \$2 million tax credit program on March 9. ■

Updates

Georgia Governor Vetoes Religious Exemptions Bill

Georgia Republican Gov. Nathan Deal vetoed a wide-ranging religious exemption bill on March 28. The bill, passed by the legislature, would grant religious organizations the right to deny employment based on religion, or deny services to those whose lifestyle offends an owner's religion.

Atlanta's influential business community was united in its opposition to the legislation, and the National Football League threatened to block any Super Bowl consideration. The Atlanta Braves baseball team said the bill was "detrimental to our community and bad for Georgia." Many Georgia-based Fortune 500 corporations called for a veto, including Coca Cola, Delta Airlines, Google, Home Depot, UPS, Verizon and Wells Fargo among others.

Gov. Deal said, "I have examined the protections that this bill proposes to provide to the faith based community and I can find no examples of any of those circumstances occurring in our state."

Similar bills have been enacted in North Carolina and Mississippi, causing consternation among business groups headquartered there (especially North Carolina). Mississippi's law is considered discriminatory, allowing businesses to deny services to gays and lesbians (or any other people) if it violates the owner's religious beliefs. Clerks could deny same-sex marriage licenses based on their personal religious beliefs.

These so-called religious protection bills are popping up with alarming regularity, pitting religious fundamentalists against corporate business and sports entities, which favor inclusiveness and an open environment. Governors in Virginia, South Dakota and Tennessee have vetoed or helped kill those proposals.

Garrett Epps, professor of constitutional law at the University of Baltimore, explained in *The Atlantic* April 4, "All these measures transfer power from the less powerful party to the more powerful one. All of them explicitly privilege one set of religious beliefs, centered around those of conservative Christianity. All of them simply brush aside the consciences of the less powerful parties. In the new world of religious freedom, the less powerful just don't count."

Gulen Schools Head for Military Bases

The wide network of charter schools linked to exiled Turkish Muslim cleric Fetullah Gulen is trying to expand its activities on U.S. military bases. The schools, which are staffed by mostly Turkish men, operate under many names. The Coral Academy of Science Las Vegas (CASLV) is negotiating with the U.S. Air Force to locate a charter school at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. This would be the second Gulen school on a military base. It opened a school at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Arizona in 2009.

These schools frequently use the terms "science academy" or "math and science" academy or other positive names such as "horizon," "noble" and "vision" to lure prospective parents and students.

Gulen schools are found in 27 states. Texas is by far their stronghold, with 48 schools, followed by Ohio (17), California (12), Florida (11), Missouri (8), New Jersey (6), Arizona (6), and Arkansas (5). There are four schools in Illinois, Maryland, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania. Three schools exist in Indiana, Massachusetts, New York and North

Carolina, while Nevada has two. There is one school in Colorado, the District of Columbia, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah and Wisconsin.

Many Gulen schools have come under fire for financial irregularities, substandard education, and inadequate faculty, causing 17 schools to close since 2010. A Texas law firm filed suit in May asking the Texas Education Agency to investigate these schools for alleged illegal activities.

Idaho, Tennessee Governors Veto Bible Bills

Idaho Gov. Butch Otter vetoed legislation that would have expressly permitted the Bible to be used for reference purposes in literature, history, music and world geography. "I have deep respect and appreciation for the Bible as religious doctrine as well as a piece of historic literature," the Republican governor wrote in his April 5 veto message, "but allowing this bill to become law is a direct contravention to the Idaho constitution and would result in costly litigation for Idaho public schools."

Another Republican, Gov. Bill Haslam of Tennessee, vetoed a bill that would have named the Bible the state's official book. The governor's April 15 veto recognized that Tennessee is a religiously conservative state, in fact the most evangelical state in the union. He praised the Bible as a "sacred text" and an "inspired" book, but warned, "If we are recognizing the Bible as a sacred text, then we are violating the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Tennessee by designating it as the official state book." On April 20 the Tennessee House reversed itself and refused to override the veto. In fact the bill, which had passed 55-38, was rejected 43-50, as a dozen legislators changed their minds.

Planned Parenthood: Ups and Downs

While Florida became the 11th state to defund Planned Parenthood (PP), and other states continue to chip away at reproductive access and funding, Maryland passed the Contraceptive Equity Act in April, which closes gaps in contraceptive coverage in Medicaid and in insurance plans. PP backed the comprehensive legislation, which expands access to various kinds of contraception.

The Obama administration's Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services sent a letter on April 19 to all state Medicaid offices warning that terminating funding may violate federal law. *Washington Post* reporter Lena Sun explained, "The guidance emphasizes that states cannot target providers for impermissible reasons and are required to treat similar types of providers equitably."

Captive School Fails

A school in a tiny central Illinois town, Teutopolis, has agreed, in an out-of-court settlement, to suspend starting the day with Mass and prayer services at the adjacent St. Francis of Assisi Church. The public school building is owned by the Catholic Diocese of Springfield, which rents it to the school system.

The ACLU represented a number of parents who objected to the arrangement whereby their children waited in the gym, playground or computer lab until the religious services ended. "When government practices favor one particular religious group, the religious liberty of everyone is diminished," said Rebecca Glenberg, an ACLU senior staff

attorney. “We have reached a resolution that protects students from being stigmatized or excluded simply because their family is not of the majority faith.”

About 20% of the elementary school’s 500 students opted out of the religious program. These hybrid public-parochial schools, called “captive schools” by critics, were common in the 1940s and 1950s in small, heavily Catholic rural areas. One case reached the New Mexico Supreme Court in 1948.

Washington Charters Challenged Again

Washington State public education organizations are planning another lawsuit against a bill reinstating charter schools. Washington Gov. Jay Inslee allowed a bill reinstating charter schools to become law without his signature on April 3. The measure requires charters to find new funding sources and adds more regulations.

Eight charters, which have remained open as specialized district programs and home-schooling centers after the state supreme court declared them unconstitutional six months ago, will be able to reopen in 2016-17.

Tennessee Allows Counselors to Refuse Services

Tennessee Gov. Bill Haslam signed a bill on April 27 allowing counselors and therapists to refuse services to patients based on their “sincerely held” religious beliefs. Tennessee is the first state to enact such a law. The American Counseling Association denounced the law as “an unprecedented attack” on their profession, and numerous Christian counselors said the law was unnecessary since therapists routinely refer patients to other specialists who have greater expertise.

ARL in Action

An attempt to divert money from publicly-funded Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools to private schools is being opposed by ARL and its dozens of allies in the National Council for Public Education (NCPE).

The bill (S2711), sponsored by Sen. John McCain (R-AZ), would grant \$15,000 per pupil for private school tuition in the form of Educational Savings Accounts (ESA), which are legal in Arizona.

The April 6 letter to the Senate Indian Affairs Committee said, “Sending federal dollars to state ESA programs is unprecedented, and the loss of funds to the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools will be devastating.”

The Obama administration is also opposed. Acting Assistant Interior Secretary Lawrence Roberts noted that the McCain bill would harm small schools since the majority of BIE schools are located in communities with fewer than 10,000 people. Most Native students live miles from private schools. In his committee testimony, Roberts said that Arizona has 291 private schools but only six are on Indian reservations.

Patricia Whitefoot, president of the National Indian Education Association, said she was “concerned with the implications of this bill,” including loss of funds, tribal sovereignty and academic performance. About 8% of all Native youths attend BIE schools nationwide, according to the Interior Department, but only 50% graduate.

Americans Think Religious Liberty Is Declining

Americans think religious liberty is declining, by 60% to 36%, in a national survey conducted by Life Way Research in Nashville. The survey of 1,000 adults conducted in September 2015 and released on March 30, found a majority of all religious groups concurring with this gloomy assessment. Among evangelicals 71% agreed, as did 65% of “other” faiths, including Jews and Muslims, 56% of Catholics and 55% of mainline Protestants. Even 46% of the religiously nonaffiliated felt religious freedom is in decline.

Muslim Ban Would Be Unworkable

Foreign Policy magazine’s March 8 issue concluded: “Banning Muslims from the United States is the world’s dumbest idea. Donald Trump’s proposal is politically, morally, and strategically wrong. It also doesn’t make any sense and would cause incalculable damage to the global standing of the United States.”

The magazine observed that the idea “will be impossible to implement” and “that no one ever seriously considered banning visitors simply by virtue of their religion. The costs of Trump’s policy – political and economic – would be huge.”

International Updates

Belfast: The conservative Protestant-Catholic consensus on abortion is causing international criticism after a woman was sentenced to three months in prison after taking medicine to induce a miscarriage. Patrick Corrigan, Amnesty International’s director in Northern Ireland, said: “The criminalization of women in Northern Ireland must stop. Reproductive healthcare must be taken out of the realm of criminal justice and addressed as an issue of public health and human rights. Abortion should be a matter for women and their doctors, not judges.”

Corrigan added, in *The Guardian* on April 6, “Northern Ireland’s abortion law must be changed to bring it into line with international standards. Abortion must be decriminalized and women should be able to access free and legal abortions in cases of fatal fetal abnormality, rape and incest.”

Bogotá: Colombia’s highest court recognized the legality of same-sex marriage on April 28, becoming the fourth South American country to do so. Presiding Judge María Victoria Calle, speaking for a 6-3 majority, wrote, “All people are free to choose independently to start a family in keeping with their sexual orientation, receiving equal treatment under the constitution and the law. The current definition of the institution of marriage in civil law applies to them in the same way as it does for couples of different sexes.”

Dhaka: Islam will remain the state religion of Bangladesh after the nation’s high court rejected a petition for disestablishment on March 28. The three judges did not even allow testimony. Bangladesh was officially declared a secular state after the 1971 war of independence from Pakistan. In 1988 the military junta declared Islam the state religion in order to appease the growing Islamist movement.

AFP press reported, “Constitutional changes dating back over three decades have put Bangladesh in the unusual position of being officially

continued on page 14

International Updates, *continued from page 13*

secular while still having Islam as a state religion. Hasina's government has brought back secularism as a pillar of the constitution, but promised it would not ratify any laws that go against the central tenets of Islam."

Bangladesh has been riven by religious controversy in the past three years, with widespread attacks on secular and non-Muslim individuals.

Ottawa: Canada's new Liberal Party government closed down the Office of Religious Freedom (ORF), established by the previous conservative government in 2013. Foreign affairs minister Stéphane Dion says his government "shares the same conviction concerning freedom of religion or belief" but thinks religious rights should be considered part of a broad human rights agenda. ORF chairman Raymond De Souza said the office is being closed "because the government does not place a priority on the work itself."

The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada expressed "deep disappointment" over the closure. So did Jewish, Sikh and Muslim community leaders, who said on April 6: "While these projects do not always make headlines, we believe they laudably reflect a practical and effective role Canada can play in mitigating the plight of persecuted religious minorities around the world."

Vatican City: Democratic presidential candidate Bernie Sanders spoke on the concept of a "moral economy" at an international con-

ference sponsored by the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences on April 15. The Vermont senator told *The Washington Post*: "I am grateful to the Vatican for inviting me to talk about an issue that is very dear to my heart, which is how we create a moral economy that works for all of the people rather than just the top one percent. I will also in my remarks be addressing the planetary crisis of climate change and the moral imperative to make sure we leave this planet in a way that is healthy and habitable for future generations."

Sanders briefly met Pope Francis on April 16 at the Vatican guest house, Casa Santa Marta. Sanders praised Francis for "playing a transformative role in the world." The American press spent most of its coverage speculating on the political implications of the address, which were downplayed by the Vatican and the Sanders campaign.

Warsaw: Poland's parliament will soon consider a proposal to outlaw all abortions, even though the nation already has one of the most restrictive abortion laws in the European Union. Wrote Reuters on April 3: "Poland currently allows terminating pregnancy only at an early stage and when it threatens the life or health of the mother, when the baby is likely to be permanently handicapped or when pregnancy originates from a crime, for example rape or incest."

The nation's powerful Catholic bishops urged the ban in a letter read in all churches. Reuters reported, "The debate around reproductive rights has been building up for months. The conservative Law and Justice (PiS) party, which came to power in October, plans to tighten regulations to bring them into line with the Catholic Church's teachings, infuriating liberals and women's rights activists." ■

Books and Culture



The Curious Case of Kiryas Joel: The Rise of a Village Theocracy and the Battle to Defend the Separation of Church and State, by Louis Grumet with John Caher. Chicago Review Press, 2016, 286 pp., \$27.99.

This is a stand-up-and-cheer kind of book, since church-state separation victories have been few and far between in the last few decades. It is not often that a plaintiff in a successful U.S. Supreme Court case tells the inside story of how the case developed and finally resulted in a great victory for separation of church and state.

The case was *Kiryas Joel v. Grumet*, in which a Satmar Hasidic village in Orange County, New York, sought to create a theocracy that extended even to the public schools.

Founded in 1977, "The village was governed largely as a theocracy. The children were educated in private yeshivas (religious schools), and civil disputes were resolved by Jewish law, not the laws of the State of New York." The residents "then exerted extraordinary political pressure to persuade Cuomo and the New York State Legislature to create a publicly funded school district catering to the interests of their sect—marking the first time in American history that a governmental unit was established for a religious group."

After numerous state court rulings, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6-3 in 1994 to reject a public school system based on religion. But even after that decision, Gov. Mario Cuomo "would attempt to execute an end run against the U.S. Supreme Court." It took until 1999 to thwart new schemes.

On some levels, little has changed. "Since then, the village of Kiryas Joel has grown enormously (a population of around twenty-two thousand in 2014), spurred by extremely low local taxes and incredible

amounts of politically acquired state and federal aid. Its theocratic village leaders still know how to use their clout and are still remarkably adept at controlling and delivering votes—and therefore controlling the political process on select issues. At the state level, the Satmar continue to get financial aid and grants of power available to no other religious group; both political parties fight over who can do more for them."

Grumet reflects, "As I look back, I see that Kiryas Joel was a crucial benchmark at a critical juncture. I am certain both Jefferson and Madison would applaud the bottom-line result of the case, and equally certain that they would be gravely troubled by what has occurred since. It is my hope that another lawyer somewhere in our constitutional landscape will have the case, the nerve, and the support to carry the Jefferson-Madison banner to a new generation of American citizens and judges and to preserve our religious freedom."

This book should be required reading in law schools and political science courses in undergraduate colleges.

—Al Menendez

We Gather Together: The Religious Right and the Problem of Interfaith Politics, by Neil J. Young. Oxford University Press, 2016, 412 pp., \$34.95.

The rumblings of conservative discontent with the earth-shattering changes in American life during the 1960s led to the development of a Religious Right backlash in the late 1970s. The author surveys the "history of anti-ecumenism, conservative interfaith dialogue and the rise of the Christian Right" in this well-documented and thoroughly researched book.

Join Americans for Religious Liberty!

PO Box 6656, Silver Spring, MD 20916

I want to do my part to help Americans for Religious Liberty halt the threats to religious, intellectual and personal freedom.

This is a: Renewal New Membership Extra Donation

\$25 Individual \$50 Sustaining \$500 Sponsoring
 \$35 Family \$100 Supporting \$1000 Patron

\$15 Student and Low Income

If you would prefer your journal to be sent via email, please include your email address:

Enclosed is my/our check for \$_____.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Contributions to ARL are tax-deductible. The ARL journal is sent to all contributors.

He notes, "Given their histories and their deep theological convictions, the possibility of a conservative ecumenism uniting conservative Catholics, Mormons, and evangelicals to affect American culture and politics was an ambitious, though unlikely, prospect... Standing together, bound by a common purpose and shared concerns, Mormons, Catholics, and evangelicals might have become an unbreakable force." But it all "unraveled" because of "long-simmering tensions and suspicions among theological rivals."

One reason why the Religious Right remained overwhelmingly dominated by hardline fundamentalist Protestants was a historic anti-Catholicism and anti-Mormonism among its leaders and constituents. Despite Moral Majority founder Jerry Falwell's claims of widespread Catholic support, "Catholics refused to join an organization they perceived as ultimately anti-Catholic... New overtures to Catholics could not erase memories of the long-standing anti-Catholicism among the most conservative branches of American Protestantism." In addition, "Memories aside, anti-Catholicism remained alive at the grassroots level of the Moral Majority."

Falwell remained a prisoner of the past. "In seeking to establish an ecumenical organization, Falwell had developed a particularly narrow political vision that reflected Southern conservatism more than Judeo-Christian religious traditionalism"

Anti-Mormonism was widespread among evangelicals who saw the LDS Church "as a dangerous, virus-like insurgent that spread rapidly through devious means."

Even the 1980s Christian Coalition was unable to extend its influence beyond its evangelical base. Another factor is that the majority of Catholic voters disagreed with Religious Right political opinions and strategies.

Young argues that religion still trumps politics, even among those who agree on some political issues.

—Al Menendez

Pope Francis Among the Wolves: The Inside Story of a Revolution, by Marco Politi. Columbia University Press, 2015, 270 pp., \$27.95.

Merchants in the Temple: Inside Pope Francis's Secret Battle Against Corruption in the Vatican, by Gianluigi Nuzzi. Henry Holt and Company, 2015, 224 pp., \$28.00.

These two newly-translated books by prominent *vaticanisti*, a hardy brand of Italian journalists who specialize in the inner workings of the Holy See, are well worth reading.

One of these venerable *vaticanisti* is Marco Politi, whose *Pope Francis Among the Wolves* views Francis as a true reformer. "If he succeeds in transforming the Synods of Bishops into a permanent instrument of coparticipation in papal government... the revolution of Jorge Mario Bergoglio will become irreversible."

The author is clearly a partisan of Pope Francis and his agenda for change. "What Francis wants is an open church that looks the world in the face. He criticizes religious institutions that project a forbidding presence... The church that Francis wants is a church not obsessed by the uncoordinated transmission of a hoard of doctrines that it strives 'miserably' to impose. Quite the contrary: he wants a church ready to run the risk of measuring up to modern humanity in the real world..."

Politi warns, however, "To change the orientation of the central apparatus of the church will be one of the most difficult challenges of his pontificate."

Financial problems remain a disconcerting factor. "The scandals that periodically explode in the media wreak incalculable harm on the Holy See... For this milieu of crooked operators, a pope who aims at a total cleanup is worse than annoying."

The author deals briefly with such contentious issues as birth control and divorce, but stresses their importance. "The issues of family life constitute a decisive test in which Francis is putting at stake his credibility as a reformer and his authority within the church."

The reactionary "conservative forces" remain his enemies. "A restructured and slimmed-down curia will mean a loss of power, influence, career prospects, and income for a certain class of ecclesiastical bureaucrats who have lived off it for centuries."

Time is running out. "The wager of Francis's revolution will be won or lost in the next few years. His adversaries are tenacious."

Merchants in the Temple concentrates on financial matters, including the Vatican's real estate holdings, the pension funds, the annual "Peter's Pence" contributions from national churches, and even the vast underreported and unregulated expenditures at the Vatican office that oversees the canonization of saints.

Nuzzi does not hold back his punches. "There is a black hole in the heart of the Church that took great efforts for Francis to uncover: A black hole created by mismanagement of the Vatican's finances and compounded by swindling and accounting fraud."

He is also less confident that Francis will succeed because "the situation is much more complex and muddled." In short, "I believe that his

continued on page 16



Americans for Religious Liberty

PO Box 6656

Silver Spring, MD 20916

NONPROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SOUTHERN, MD
PERMIT NO. 4004

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Books and Culture, *continued from page 15*

project cannot be deferred or avoided, but it is hard to argue that he will succeed in bringing to completion his ambitious mission. There are too many interests at stake, both inside and outside the walls.”

Of the two, I prefer Politi’s book because it covers more topics and is more richly documented.

—*Al Menendez*

The Lively Experiment: Religious Toleration in America from Roger Williams to the Present, edited by Chris Beneke and Christopher S. Grenda. Rowman & Littlefield, 2015, 342 pp., \$65.00.

This anthology of 19 essays celebrating the contribution of Roger Williams to the development of religious liberty in America is a winner. While only three essays deal directly with Williams, one of them by Teresa M. Bejan concluded, “Today, Williams’s reputation as the ‘First Founder’ has never been more secure.”

Though toleration is a bad word today, implying something less than liberty, it was a revolutionary concept in Williams’s day and in subsequent centuries, a great step forward over repression. The varied essays by prominent scholars include the experience of Muslims, Methodists, Catholics, Mormons and other minority faiths. One excellent essay by Steven K. Green describes the long history of the debate over public aid to religious schools, while Jacob Betz recalls the controversy over the question of religious observances in state-funded orphanages and reformatories in late nineteenth century New York. Betz concludes, “The ultimate passage of the New York Freedom of Worship Bill meant that the city’s dominant Protestantism had been forced to accommodate the minority’s Catholic faith.... Yet, as the first numerically powerful religious minority in the United States, Catholics used democratic action to force the state to acknowledge alternative civic identities through an accommodation of minority religious conscience.”

Ronit Stahl shows how the U.S. military establishment resisted religious inclusion and opposed efforts to accommodate Buddhists, Eastern Orthodox Christians and Jews. “The military declined to rec-

oncile itself to the diversity of American religious life.... Bureaucratic inertia in the face of religious complexity thus perpetuated a truncated and simplified religious order.”

Finally, by 1962 “the military acknowledged religious diversity in its midst and extended recognition even to atheists and agnostics.... This democratization shifted the responsibility for categorization from the state to the soldier. By placing the power of classification and identification in the hands of individual servicemen, the military also eliminated the validation that accompanied a list of officially sanctioned religious identities.”

This collection advances our knowledge of U.S. religious liberty history in a lively way.

—*Al Menendez*

Scholarship for Church-Run Private School

Judge David Ortley is wrong in approving a publicly funded scholarship for a church-run private school. The Department of Revenue correctly held that such diversions of public funds violate Article X, Section 6 of the Montana constitution.

This diversion of public funds may be small, but it is part of a decades long national foot-in-the-door campaign to undermine and privatize the public schools that serve 90% of America’s kids.

Most Americans oppose these moves, as 28 state referendums from coast to coast between 1966 and 2014 have shown opposition at 2 to 1. The 2015 Gallup education poll registered opposition at 57% to 31%.

What is behind Article X, Section 6 is the principle found in the First Amendment and nearly all state constitutions that even indirect diversion of public funds to religious institutions violates the religious freedom right of all taxpayers not to be compelled to support religious institutions not of their own free choice.

Edd Doerr, President, ARL

Great Falls (Montana) Tribune, April 16, 2016