

The Historical Development of Christian Lobbying Into Permanent Christian Lobby Organizations In The United States of America

Inaugural Dissertation

For obtaining the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Faculty of Protestant Theology

at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe
University in Frankfurt am Main

Submitted by

Derrick L. Boykin

from: Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A

October 30, 2019

1. Evaluator: Prof. Dr. Markus Wriedt

2. Evaluator: Prof. Dr. Jan Stievermann

Date of the verbal examination: September 30, 2020

Copyright © 2022 by Derrick Lafonzo Boykin
All Rights Reserved

Contents

Abbreviations

INTRODUCTION

Research Theme.....	1
Public Interests and Relevance.....	3
Sources.....	5
Methodological Approach.....	6
Thesis Statement.....	8
Current State of Research.....	9
Literature Review.....	10
Summary and Outlook.....	14

CHAPTER 1

Defining Lobbying

Basic Definitions of Lobbying.....	15
Lobbying Expenditures.....	18
Grass Roots Lobbying and Direct Lobbying Defined.....	19
Offensive and Defensive Lobbying Tactics.....	20
Lobbying and Self-Interests.....	23
Lobbying Theories.....	24
A History of Lobbying in the United States.....	30
A Brief History of Ecclesiastical Political Influence in Colonial America.....	35
Ecclesiastical Bodies and the Founding of the United States Government.....	41
Ecclesiastical Lobbying and Religious Liberty Post-Declaration of Independence.....	51
Ecclesiastical Lobbying and the Institution of Slavery.....	56
History of African American Lobbying During the Antebellum Period.....	66
History of African American Lobbying During the Civil War Period.....	76
Civil Rights Movement and African American Lobbying.....	83
A Brief History of Moral and Social Reform in the 19th and 20th Centuries.....	98

CHAPTER 2

Christian Lobbying Organizations (CLOs)

Defining Christian Lobby Organizations.....	107
CLOs' Organizational Structures.....	112
Christian Lobbying in Juxtaposition to Christian Advocacy: What's the difference?....	121
CLOs: Social Justice and Christian Morality?	126
The Historical Emergence of CLOs.....	145
A Brief History of Protestant CLOs Prior to 1970.....	154
A Brief History of the Roman Catholic CLO Prior to 1970.....	161

CHAPTER 3
An Oral History of CLOs

Methodological Approach: Oral History Interviews and Thematic Data Analysis.....166
Bread for the World: A Mainline Protestant CLO Perspective.....170
Concerned Women for America: A Conservative Evangelical CLO Perspective.....182
A History of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Lobbying Offices:
A Roman Catholic Perspective.....192
Theological Framework for Church Lobbying: Methodological Approaches.....205
Bread for the World’s Theological Framework for Church Lobbying.....207
Concerned Women for America’s Theological Framework for Church Lobbying.....210
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Office of Government Relations on
Catholic Social Teaching and Church Lobbying.....217

CHAPTER 4
Theological Profile for CLOs

CLOs: Political Theology.....221
CLOs: John Calvin’s Political Theology231
CLOs: Social Gospel Theory.....234
CLOs: Christian Realism238
Conclusion242

END NOTES245

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....277

Abbreviations

Bread	Bread for the World
CLO	Christian Lobby Organization
CWA	Concerned Women for America
FRC	The Family Research Council
LDA	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995
NCCB	National Conference of Catholic Bishops
NCWC	National Catholic Welfare Council
SCLC	Southern Christian Leadership Conference
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USCCB	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
USCCB OGR	USCCB Office of Governmental Affairs

Introduction

Research Theme: What is its academic importance?

The establishment and exponential growth of Christian¹ political organizations as permanent lobby interest groups in Washington, DC is a contemporary phenomenon.² A report published by the Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public Life entitled, "Lobbying for the Faithful: Religious Advocacy Groups in Washington, DC," reveals that the very first religious³ lobby organizations actually emerged in the late nineteenth century.⁴ However, as Hertzke confirms, "The number of organizations engaged in religious lobbying or religion-related advocacy in Washington, D.C., has increased roughly fivefold in the past four decades, from fewer than 40 in 1970 to more than 200 today."⁵

By the latter half of the twentieth century, a documented, substantial quantitative increase had occurred in the total number of Christian political organizations operating in the nation's Capital with the sole purpose of influencing Congress and the administration through direct lobbying.⁶ The Pew Research Center found that 44 percent of the 216 lobby organizations consulted for its study self-identified as Christian.⁷ This number does not include certain religious organizations with constituencies comprised of diverse faith traditions that were actually founded by Christian groups, or continue to be guided by mission statements grounded on Christian dogma. Thus, it is accurate to submit that such organizations are Christian by charter but not exclusively Christian in the composition of their membership base. Guided by Christian principles, while simultaneously inclusive of other faith traditions or exclusively Christian in makeup, current Christian Lobby Organizations (CLOs) are numerous and veritable forces in the realm of power politics in Washington, D.C.

The issues agendas and practices of CLOs are as diverse as the theological formulations that inform their respective policy pursuits. Whether advocating for certain U.S. foreign policy approaches that address humanitarian crises throughout the world, such as complex emergencies involving war/conflict, drought, disease or famine, or advocating for certain domestic policies that tackle hunger, poverty, or homelessness, CLOs are active and engaged, continually implementing innovative strategies with their accompanying tactics to influence the legislative process.⁸

Moreover, certain CLOs' lobbying efforts are focused on a varied set of individual moral behavioral choices, such as abortion, the legal definition of marriage, or pornography.⁹ While others are solely directed at, as Olson affirms, "representing the political interests of the denomination."¹⁰

This historical development—as it specifically relates to the normalization of CLOs as institutionalized vehicles for Christian political engagement—is of great significance and demands further theological investigation, reflection, and critique. This is due to the nature of the evolution of Christian lobbying into permanent organizational fixtures within the body politic of the United States, with demonstrated far-reaching influence upon both the church and state.

Correspondingly, Charles Taylor in his work entitled, *A Secular Age*, argues that Western civilization is most suitably characterized as "post-Christian" where "belief is an option."¹¹ He adds, "In our 'secular' societies, you can engage fully in politics without ever encountering God, that is, coming to a point where the crucial importance of the God of Abraham for this whole enterprise is brought home forcefully and unmistakably."¹²

Contrary to Taylor's assertions, the existence and rapid multiplication of CLOs in the United States certainly challenge a vital postulation upon which his expansive work is based. These entities do not only seek to bring the faith of the 'God of Abraham' into the public square; unquestionably, they aim to shape correlative national policies in alignment with their Christian convictions that in force have domestic and international effect. In the Occident, secularization's unique development and material impact within respective nations throughout is not being called into question here. For in Europe and the United States, as Bryan Wilson accurately portrays, "empirical evidences can be advanced of a process of social change in which religion loses social significance."¹³ In the context of the United States, however, CLOs appear to constitute a sacral political convention in dialectical tension with a pluralistic American society.

Therefore, a primary objective of this study is to investigate the historical emergence and development of this religio-political phenomenon within the context of ecclesiastical historical engagement in the United States of America. Furthermore, three theologically and politically divergent CLOs within the 45-year timeframe of 1970-2015 are considered. They are as follows: Bread for the World (Bread), Concerned Women for America (CWA), and United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' Office of Governmental Relations (USCCB's OGR). The aforementioned

qualitative data reflect an unprecedented rise in the establishment of ecclesiastical political entities of this type in Washington, D.C., beginning in the early 1970s. This development undergirds the author's decision to begin with 1970 and conclude with 2015—as the *terminus post quem* and the *terminus ante quem*, respectively—for this study. Correspondingly, Bread and CWA were both founded in the 1970s, and so were part of this remarkable burgeoning of Christian political institutionalization. On the other hand, 2015, as the concluding year, offers a feasible date to frame this study that allows for the inclusion of the latest developments within each of the organizations studied.

Moreover, this study will seek to answer the following questions:

- What were the contributing historical factors that influenced the rise of CLOs, resulting in their normalization in contemporary American society?
- What are the biblical, theological, moral, or recondite justifications that contributed to CLO's formation and the resulting policy positions pursued?
- Considering church history, what is the theological profile of CLOs: Christian realism, advocacy, charity, etc.?

By probing into these questions, the multifaceted ways in which CLOs have shaped U.S. national and international policies will be detailed. The reciprocal interplay between CLOs and church doctrine and praxis will also be further explicated.

Public Interests and Relevance: Why should people read this work and what is its relevance with regard to actual social, cultural, political, and economic problems?

Christian lobbying in the context of the United States' liberal democracy¹⁴ is not a novel endeavor. A cursory historical review reveals certain segments of the Christian religious establishment, in any given historical period of the nation, exercising the power of their voice and citizenship on behalf of enslaved or disenfranchised members of society in an attempt to catalyze societal change—be it social, political, or economic—expressly through public policy reform. From the Quakers' distinct leadership in the Abolitionist movement,¹⁵ to Frances Willard's and the Women's Christian Temperance Union's unyielding efforts to attain universal suffrage for women,¹⁶ Christian advocacy by the means of lobbying is an enduring reality on the American political landscape. However, Hertzke makes the following key

distinction: “Religious advocacy is as old as the Republic and intimately woven into the nation’s story... Permanent religious lobbies, however, are a more recent twentieth-century phenomenon.”¹⁷

Religious lobbying organizations’ unique approach to political activism is an unprecedented development in United States’ history. Hence for CLOs exclusively, this kind of involvement appears to represent an evolution in Christian socio-political praxis. For the key distinguishing factor is their permanency as an institutionalized lobbying presence, with the explicit designs to impact the social, economic, and political undertakings of the nation through policies perceived most in consonance with their organizations’ hermeneutical application of Christian doctrine.

In the context of a broader American pluralism, CLOs, as political subgroups, are radical expressions of an evolving brand of Christianity determined to shape public policy into the image and likeness of their deepest held convictions of what a *nation under God* should be. Consequently, certain CLOs’ sustained lobbying efforts are focused on perceived social or economic injustices that they contend can only be rectified by legislative action, e.g. criminal justice reform.¹⁸ On the other hand, what makes other groups’ organizational activities particularly distinct is their persistent lobbying work on a broad range of issues that are not overtly connected to some pervasive or immediately identifiable injustice. For example, there are organizations that focus perennially on agriculture, trade, and immigration policies, and under each corresponding heading draft and support bills that best reflect their particular Christian convictions in relation to the issue of focus.¹⁹

There is a dearth of theological inquiry into the activities of CLOs, and in some respects, arguably minimal public awareness about their undertakings. Although the fact remains that, alongside their ecclesiastical sway, these organizations have a tangible social, economic, and political impact broadly upon national and international policy. Subsequently, because of CLOs’ Christian classification, political aspirations, and effect upon society in general, Christian theology²⁰ has much to contribute to this evolving discussion that continues to make significant progress in other social scientific disciplines. As previously discussed, theology can provide a means to assess the profile of this Christian political phenomenon by answering the key question as to whether CLOs’ activities are rooted in charity, mercy, justice, humanitarianism, or yet another theological concept or formulation. Additionally, theology can also aid in addressing

the question of whether lobbying should become a normative order or function of the Church²¹ universal.

Furthermore, behind this uniquely differentiated form of political engagement embraced by various denominations and Christian groups throughout the United States, there also appears to be an identifiable evolution in church and state relations. As noted earlier, Hertzke confirms church advocacy existed throughout the life of the nation, but not until recent history has it evolved in form to become an established and enduring institutional presence.²² Subsequently, the question emerges: Have CLOs palpably altered relations between church and state in the democratic experiment of the United States? Theology, of course, can assist in clarifying whether such an altering impact is real or imagined. Moreover, theological investigation can aid in locating any historical precedents, if existent, within church history.

Finally, there is an ever-increasing polarization within the context of American Christianity, with theologically liberal Christians at one end of the spectrum and theologically conservative Christians at the other. Their political agendas, as evident in the lobbying activities of their respective CLOs, reflect this deep divide. The following question emerges: Can theology serve to bridge or reduce this sharp divide through sound inquiry, historical analysis, and constructive dialogue?

Sources: What are the sources utilized? Why these and why not others?

During this study, primary and secondary sources are consulted. There are numerous primary sources directly published by CLOs, or by their current or former staff members, that are in the public domain and accessible for analysis. These primary resources include articles, books, histories, interviews, newsletters, policy papers, reports, website content, and videos—all of which provide valuable insight into their histories, activities, and theological underpinnings. Access to some of these classifications of data, as well as many other forms of organizational publications, are available online via resource libraries housed on many of these CLOs' websites. Additionally, face-to-face, virtual, and telephone interviews of current and former staff members have been conducted. This firsthand knowledge significantly clarifies the extent and impact of their work historically. Furthermore, in cases of actual legislation supported by CLOs, electronic governmental archives (e.g., Congress.gov) functioned as valuable resources.

In terms of secondary sources, there is a limited quantity of articles, books, and journals—specifically in the field of theology—dedicated exclusively to the topic of CLOs. The resources that are in circulation and accessible certainly provide valuable secondary material input that enhances the scope and outcome of this research project. In contrast, there is a plethora of political science, sociological, and historical material authored by scholars within their respective fields that have written on this topic. Thus, secondary sources from scholars who have delved deep into the historical or socio-political impact of CLOs within American society are consulted. These sources include and are not limited to articles, books, journals, newspapers, reviews, and website content. Incorporating their findings into this study provides key insights into understanding the impact of CLOs broadly. Furthermore, the writings of preeminent political philosophers, statesmen and politicians, whose ideas assisted in shaping the political landscape of the United States, are also considered, as they clarify how lobbying historically evolved to be a political practice protected under the U.S. Constitution. In confluence with the key primary source materials mentioned above, the secondary materials listed provide the requisite scientific data essential to successful completion of this study.

In assessing the theological profile of CLOs, there is an excess of works published by Christian historians, ethicists, and systematic theologians available for use. Such writings are narrowed down to a select few that are most relevant, in the author's opinion, to the central thesis of this work. Therefore, authors germane to the fields of political theology, the Social Gospel Movement, and Christian realism are primarily considered.

Methodological Approach: What are the techniques of inquiry and what is the methodological outline?

In the initial chapter of this study, the research investigates lobbying as a political practice in the United States of America by clarifying the different forms of lobbying in general, the various outlays and strategies lobbyists' employ, the relationship between secular lobbying and self-interest, as well as a brief consideration of theories associated with lobbying as a political practice. In the subsequent section, the author provides a historical overview of lobbying in the context of the United States of America. As a result, a more in-depth summary of how ecclesiastical lobbying

emerged, commencing with the Colonial period of the fifteenth century and extending to the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, is outlined. In fact, several sections are dedicated to exploring the historical engagement of African American ecclesiastical bodies or personalities as lobby agents which played a key role in fostering the significant numerical growth of lobbying organizations established in Washington during the 1960s. Additionally, a brief section is dedicated to select examples of lobbying efforts by ecclesiastical bodies focused on moral and social reform during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In chapter 2, the author defines CLOs as distinctive organizational entities, clarifies differences between their lobbying activities and those of secular lobby groups. The next sections are dedicated to a descriptive analysis of CLOs' organizational structures, their strategic usage of the terms lobbying and advocacy, and their identification with Christian morality and social justice. Next, a detailed historical review of the emergence of CLOs on the national scene is explored with the primary focus resting on the dates prior to 1970. It is important to note that the historical methodological approach²³ of analysis is appropriated to construct the best possible historical and analytic overview of CLOs' emergence upon the national scene and historical activities. These sections additionally explore a range of CLOs' political undertakings and their direct impact upon federal legislation.

Chapter 3 includes sections that cover the histories of Bread, CWA, and the USCCB's OGR between 1970-2010. Such examination allows this study to capture a broader ecumenical perspective, as each of these organizations is theologically reflective of Mainline Protestantism, Evangelicalism, or the Roman Catholic church traditions, respectively. Moreover, through direct interviews conducted with several current and former executives of these three organizations, considerable qualitative data is gathered. Thus, the methodological approach of oral history is employed to detail documented historical activities. To define this scientific approach, Perks and Thomson contend, "oral history... [is] the interviewing of eye-witness participants in the events of the past for the purposes of historical reconstruction."²⁴ Thus, the oral history and the historical methodological approach converge to undergird this study.

Besides the core group of CLOs mentioned, this study includes other organizations whose historical activities are essential inputs to better understand the historical development of CLOs broadly in the context of the United States. Nonetheless, for each of the three organizations noted, specific campaigns within the

45-year period targeted are considered to construct a clearer picture of their organizational practices, as well as their impact upon domestic and international policy. Furthermore, the following are reviewed: their history of methods and policies and their efficacy in influencing national decision makers in order to shape policy; their practices and procedures in attaining relevant data essential to policy formulation; their respective policy positions drafted, supported and promulgated; their efficacy in shaping public opinion and moving Congress, the president, or other actors in the federal government; and finally, the practical effects of their advocacy efforts upon domestic and international politics.

In subsequent sections, the author examines the purported theological rationales or impetuses that prompt and sustain these organizations' advocacy efforts. In these sections, an inquiry into the theological constructions of each CLO is presented.

The last chapter is focused on constructing a theological profile for CLOs. A synthesis of the information acquired in the preceding chapters, alongside a select group of theologians in the fields of political theology, namely the Social Gospel movement, and Christian realism, assist in building this profile.

To review, this study covers the following: (1) defining lobbying, (2) a historical overview of lobbying in the United States, (3) a history of ecclesiastical lobbying in the United States (3) defining CLOs, (4) the historical emergence of CLOs, (5) CLOs' organizational structures, (6) brief histories of Bread, CWA, and the USCCB's OGR, (7) theological formulations of the named organizations, (8) and a theological profile for CLOs generally. As such, this research will be interdisciplinary in nature—primarily with historical, political, sociological, and theological insights.

Thesis Statement: What is the thesis or main proposition of this study?

In the ensuing chapters, the author argues that CLOs' goal to politicize the Gospel of Jesus Christ to achieve specific statutory objectives—as institutionalized lobby associations—signifying an underlying political Gospel theory that is exclusively contrived for liberal democracies as an outcome of a historically contextualized biblical interpretation. This theoretical framework substantiates CLOs' political activities as a viable means to rectify social, economic, and political injustices in society through means of democratic participation. It is, therefore, held amongst its proponents that institutionalized Christian lobbying is a legitimate (or, legally protected by the

Constitution) and theologically substantiated (as defined by Anselm: “faith seeking understanding”²⁵) praxis for Christians to ensure a just and more equitable society as sanctioned by their respective Gospel topoi.

It is also argued that, as a political contrivance, CLOs of the mid-late twentieth century intellectual roots are traced back to the schools of thought within the North American Social Gospel and Christian realism movements.

Current State of Research: Is there any actual research on this topic? How does this study fit into the larger body of scholarship on this theme?

Presently, in the field of Christian theology, there is minimal research and theological reflection on CLOs as a socio-political Christian phenomenon. Books and articles that cover this topic are conspicuously absent from the public purview. As already stated, there are numerous political scientists, sociologists, and scholars within various other academic disciplines that have probed into the impact of CLOs upon the body politic of the United States of America—each, of course, focusing on their own area of expertise.

Fundamentally, this study is an innovative interdisciplinary analysis in the field of church history, with clear implications on the trajectory of deliberations within the horizon of Christian social and political ethics today. Indeed, its aim is to spark a public debate within these branches of theology; acknowledging their unique contribution is essential to understanding lobbying as an ecclesiastical practice. As Coleman fittingly argues, “no human enterprise or arena escapes God’s scrutiny, judgment, presence, providence, [and] concern.”²⁶ He further asserts,

“A full-fledge Christian political ethics would treat of state and society; international law and international relations; the economy; ecology; the reality of marriage and family; medical issues of health, life and death; and questions of war and peace. It would state and defend, theologically, principles of ethics; ... and display a systematic reflection on how to apply principles and virtue to concrete, even hard, cases (casuistry).”²⁷

Hence, this pioneering research seeks to meet Coleman’s concern head-on and ignite a broader public discussion around this ecclesiastical phenomenon.

Literature Review

“In the summer of 1980, emergency food aid was desperately needed to deal with a worsening famine in Somalia and still-critical food shortage in Cambodia. But the House Appropriations Committee turned down a request from the Administration for money to pay for that aid. With a vote by the full House of Representatives coming up the following week, chances of reversing the Committee’s decision seemed slim because the Administration had withdrawn its support for additional funds. Yet the situation in those countries was critical. Bread for the World policy analyst Ernest Loevinsohn met with Representative Floyd Fithian (D-Ind.) and the two developed the following strategy. On the floor of the House, Fithian would introduce an amendment to the Committee’s legislation. The amendment would cut \$100 million from government spending on furniture while restoring \$43 million of that amount for emergency food aid. Our hope was to attract votes from those who wanted increased food aid and/or wanted to trim government spending. Meanwhile, those serving on the Bread for the World telephone networks (“quicklines”) in congressional districts throughout the country got word out to our members within a few days, asking them to wire their representatives in support of Fithian’s amendment. The strategy worked. The amendment won by a large majority. Later an official from the U.S. Agency for International Development told me, “Every penny of the \$43 million was needed to fend off starvation, especially in Somalia.”²⁸

--Art Simon, Founder of Bread for the World,
Christian Faith & Public Policy: No Grounds for Divorce

In the context of the United States’ democracy, the presence of CLOs is a tangible force, particularly as a major proponent of a moral doctrine within an international affairs debate often dominated by *Realpolitik*.²⁹ As is evident in Simon’s quote above, in cases where humanitarian emergencies arise—with or without identifiable U.S. interests—these organizations are found organizing and equipping their constituencies to advocate for public policies that address the critical needs of persons affected by such crises. The fact is there is substantiating evidence that men and women of the Christian faith—Roman Catholics, Mainline Protestants and Evangelicals— have had undeniable influence in determining the course of action national decision makers take regarding not only international policy, but domestic policy as well. As a result of such activities, CLOs are a focal point of debate in various academic disciplines.

Consequently, there are scholars that seek to understand the history, focus, method, extent, and impact of CLOs upon Washington politics. Sociologist Luke E. Ebersole in his pioneering work entitled, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*,

focuses mainly on “the legislative interests around which church lobbying has centered, and not with the political views and interest of the church public.”³⁰ Accordingly, he details a history of legislation Protestant and Roman Catholic lobbies supported prior to the 1950s, and describes the various lobbying methods they employed. These organizations’ theological rationales are absent in his work. Ebersole sagaciously concludes with the estimation that this trend would continue into the foreseeable future; hence, rightly presuming the expansion of church lobbies in Washington as an inevitable outcome.³¹ By his concluding tenor, however, it is evident he maintains a serious concern over the growing influence of the church lobbies in American politics; the defense of the ideal of separation of church and state is in his opinion paramount.³² Ebersole’s work is the first of its kind on this theme; since its initial publication, other scholars, namely Robert Wuthnow and John H. Evans, have built upon this work from a sociological perspective.³³

James L. Adams’ book entitled, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, follows Ebersole’s work historically, and is arguably the most comprehensive journalistic work covering church lobbies of his time. A journalist by profession, Adams provides valuable anecdotal insights into the pragmatism essential to navigate Washington politics, specifically through the art of compromise and coalition building amongst often unlikely partners. Such pragmatism appears, from Adams’ perspective, to have a corrupting affect upon church lobbyists. He asserts, “The new-breed church lobbyist likes the feel of power as much as the old-line politician. It is apparently a universal urge to which churchmen are not immune.”³⁴ As evident here—and similar to Ebersole’s tenor expressed above—Adams voices a disquieted sentiment toward CLOs’ mounting influence in Washington.³⁵ Despite the absence of a certain objectivity in his assessment of Christian lobbyists, Adams raises a notable correlation between the remarkable increase of church lobbies at the turn of the 1960s with that of the Civil Rights Movement: he suggests that the Civil Rights Movement provided a veritable source of inspiration and a political model for these emergent church lobbies to emulate.³⁶

The historical example of the lobbying activities of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) under the direction of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. offered another viable model, particularly in the case of socio-economic justice-oriented CLOs, worthy of replication that is essential to build a more just society.³⁷ Additionally, Dr. King’s international advocacy efforts—particularly those centered on

ending the War in Vietnam—availed a promising template for Christian lobbying groups to employ that are interested in fighting injustice internationally.³⁸ Accordingly, the Civil Rights Movement categorically functioned as an essential precursor to multiple international advocacy campaigns that follow it historically. For example, the Rev. Leon Sullivan, an African American Baptist pastor whose leadership and connection to the Civil Rights Movement is unequivocal, led the domestic campaign that advocated for divestment in South Africa. “Rev. Leon Sullivan,” Lansing and Kuruvilla substantiate, “advocated a total change in policy and a plea for a complete corporate withdrawal from South Africa. As the widely respected architect of the Sullivan Principles, a code of fair employment tenets for U.S. companies in South Africa, his announcement implied a dramatic reversal of the policy he had advocated for the last decade.”³⁹ Clarifying the history, Lewis further reveals, “By 1987, with apartheid undented by his principles and African leaders like Nelson Mandela still in prison, Mr. Sullivan toughened his approach, urging American corporations to withdraw altogether from South Africa and calling for the United States to impose trade and investment sanctions on that country.”⁴⁰ The point of emphasis here is apparent; this historically subsequent campaign to the Civil Rights Movement, which sought to put pressure on the South African government in the effort to end apartheid, was led by a pastor with direct links to Civil Rights Movement.⁴¹ The Civil Rights Movement, as Adams rightly suggests, provided a replicable prototype that contributed to the future explosion of a range of CLOs established in Washington, D.C., after the 1960s.

In terms of related works on this theme, Allan Hertzke, in his groundbreaking work, *Representing God in Washington: The Role of Religious Lobbies in the American Polity*, presents a more “detached nonjudgmental perspective of a scholar” within the field of political science.⁴² This comprehensive empirical work, as Weber argues, “does build on the insights of Ebersole and Adams in acknowledging the politicization of many churches in America, but he does so in the context of classic interest group scholarship.”⁴³ Furthermore, as the primary researcher of a 2012 report published by the Pew Research Center’s Forum on Religion & Public Life, Hertzke provides an in-depth analysis of the historical development, structures, budgets, and lobby strategies of over 200 religious lobby organizations currently in operation in Washington.⁴⁴ Akin to Hertzke’s scholarship, Weber and Jones’ research in the field of political science seeks to define the basic characteristics that constitute religious interest groups; identify comparable groups in operation; and investigate their respective origins, charters,

structures, funding sources, policies, and strategies.⁴⁵ The academicians mentioned provide valuable descriptive analyses into CLOs' structures and activities.

While the public debate concerning church lobbying reveals a strong polarization of opinion related to the issue,⁴⁶ sociologists and political scientists are clear in their findings and reveal a common trend: CLOs are active and influential in shaping United States public policy.⁴⁷

In the field of theology, the discourse surrounding CLOs, particularly as a distinct evolution in Christian theology or political engagement, is limited. There is, however, substantial material in Christian social ethics that can assist in constructing a theological profile for CLOs, specifically for organizations chiefly concerned with socio-economic justice. Namely, there are resources that abound written by theologians in the field of political theology; included in this category are proponents of the Social Gospel and Christian realism.

Accordingly, Walter Rauschenbusch, in his celebrated work entitled: *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, argues that the Social Gospel was a challenge to a certain Calvinistic doctrine that was pervasive at that time; this doctrine emphasized an individualistic concept of salvation, and concentrated on personal immorality, but ignored the evils of institutional and structural sin manifest in society.⁴⁸ The Social Gospel, according to Rauschenbusch, sought to inspire the Church of that day to broaden its doctrinal construct of salvation to include the work of redeeming and transforming societal institutions and systems. Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., greatly influenced by Rauschenbusch's theological works, confirms: "It has been my conviction ever since reading Rauschenbusch that any religion which professes to be concerned about the soul of men and is not concerned about the social and economic conditions that can scar the soul, is a spiritually moribund religion only waiting the day to be buried".⁴⁹ In fact, the Social Gospel theological formulations, as articulated by Rauschenbusch, were fundamental in shaping King's thoughts, and consequently had a profound effect on spurring the Civil Rights Movement forward. As shown, the correlation between the methods of engagement exemplified in the Civil Rights Movement, and their adoption by certain CLOs, is likewise evident in the theological formulations that undergird certain CLOs' activities today.

Converging with Rauschenbusch and other Social Gospel theorists' theological designs, Reinhold Niebuhr's Christian realist perspective serves as another compelling stream of intellectual fodder for justice-oriented CLOs' political engagement. In *Moral*

*Man and Immoral Society*⁵⁰ and *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of its Traditional Defense*,⁵¹ Niebuhr provides, “extraordinary insight into human nature, especially the behavior of nations and social groups ... the complexity of man’s social involvement and the glaring reality of collective evil.”⁵² Moreover, Niebuhr presents a poignant analysis of democratic participation as a constructive, yet practical, means for change agents to create a more just society. According to Niebuhr, “The conscious philosophy by which he rationalises his political conduct is expressed by a qualified trust in the instrument of democracy ... he believes that the democratic state can be used to establish justice.”⁵³ Hence, CLOs’ method of utilizing the mechanics of the democratic system to pursue justice finds its intellectual roots in the postulations of Niebuhr.

It is apparent that elements of Social Gospel theory and Christian Realism, in consonance one with the other, have played a vital role in shaping theological underpinnings that have assisted in inspiring CLOs dedicated to socio-economic justice. In the following chapters, this proposition is further elaborated.

Summary and Outlook: What can one do with the findings of this study?

Each generation of church leadership has a responsibility to employ a Gospel hermeneutic effectual in addressing the challenges and conditions of their generation. Specifically, considering the proliferation of democratic governments throughout the world, the contemporary challenge for indigenous church leadership is to consider how to best engage governmental systems in order to express a political love rooted in Christ by pursuing justice for all people. Consequently, certain examples of CLOs’ lobbying activities in the United States may provide a model worthy of emulation. Moreover, the findings produced from this research offer an in-depth descriptive analysis of the structures, strategies, tactics, and theologies formulated by CLOs, which may prove to be of great interest to persons or organizations currently engaged in this line of work. Lastly, the aim of the ensuing chapters’ content, analyses, and postulations is to positively contribute to the field of church history. In particular, constructing a thorough history and theological profile of CLOs is intended to spark theological discussions that inspire scholars within the field of theology to more fully consider this well-established, yet largely unquestioned, form of Christian political practice.

Chapter 1

Defining Lobbying

Basic Definitions of Lobbying

In detailing the distinctive characteristics of CLOs, as differentiated from other secular lobbying groups, it is imperative to: (1) define lobbying as a political activity in general, and (2) locate in history its origin within the context of the United States' federal system. Subsequently, the initial sections will focus solely on the first stated imperative by defining lobbying as a political activity, while the latter sections will explore the historical development of lobbying as a political practice in the United States. In this first part, the following will be explored: key definitions that attempt to describe the qualities of lobbying; a brief review of lobbying expenditures and key lobby actors; various lobbying strategies and tactics utilized by interest groups; and a brief consideration of a few key theories that seek to explain this political phenomenon.

Accordingly, Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, University of Notre Dame professor of law, offers fundamental insights into the legal classifications of lobbying. He writes, "The definitions of 'lobbying' vary significantly. The tax laws provide three definitions of lobbying, while the LDA [Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995] provides another definition."⁵⁴ As a constitutionally protected activity,⁵⁵ these legal definitions articulate its basic characteristics and scope. It is essential to accentuate in this study a key legal definition of lobbying stated in tax law. It follows: "An organization will be regarded as attempting to influence legislation [lobbying] if it contacts, or urges the public to contact, members or employees of a legislative body for the purpose of proposing, supporting, or opposing legislation, or if the organization advocates the adoption or rejection of legislation."⁵⁶ Although slightly nuanced, the language in the LDA's definition of lobbying shares the basic content codified in tax law as described. It states, "[lobbying] is the practice of trying to persuade legislators to propose, pass, or defeat legislation or to change existing laws. A lobbyist may work for a group, organization, or industry, and presents information on legislative proposals to support his or her clients' interests."⁵⁷

Legislators, too, have sought to craft their own explanation of this political activity and the actors who share in this profession. The late Senator Thaddeus Caraway of Arkansas offers the alternative characterization of a lobbyist as "one who shall,

whether for pay or otherwise, attempt to influence legislation, or to prevent legislation, by the National Congress,” further defining lobbying as “any effort to influence Congress upon any matter coming before it, whether it be by the distribution of printed matter, appearance before committees of Congress, interviewing or seeking to interview individual members of the Senate or House, or by any other means.”⁵⁸

In summary, lobbying as defined in all instances above is best understood as a method of political engagement exercised within the context of representative democracies when an individual or group seeks to influence the legislative process with the sole aim of formulating public policy most in consonance with the respective interests of the actor/s initiating the lobbying. As Berry succinctly claims: “When an interest group attempts to influence policymakers, it can be said to be engaging in lobbying.”⁵⁹

Correspondingly, it is self-evident that from the foregoing definitions, the primary targets of lobbyists’ federal lobbying efforts are members of Congress; however, the facts demonstrate lobbyists’ foci are not restricted solely to the legislative branch of government. As one political scientist of note suggests, “A Washington lobby group wants results. It pursues them wherever they are likely to be found in the governmental process.”⁶⁰ Often the executive and judicial branches of government, as well as distinct affiliates within the federal bureaucracy, are all potential targets.⁶¹ In an article entitled, “The decision to lobby bureaucrats,” Amy McKay highlights a relevant case in point related to the emergence of scholarship expressly focused on interest groups’ lobbying activities directed at non-legislative governmental institutions. “An important strain of research,” she confirms, “examines bureaucratic lobbying in a legislative context using formal models of the relationship between bureaucracies and legislatures (and occasionally, the courts, e.g., de Figueiredo and de Figueiredo 2002; Rubin et al. 2001).”⁶² These studies disclose lobbyists are recognized for building strategic relationships with key actors in governmental offices that have the potential to influence relevant policy decisions on Capitol Hill. Moreover, this research into this multidimensional approach to lobbying concludes “that lobbying in the legislative branch is highly correlated with lobbying in the executive (Boehmke et al. 2007).”⁶³

As is the case in Washington politics, the relationships and interactions between legislators, the administration, judges, bureaucratic officials, and the multitude of men and women that comprise their staff, are dynamic in nature. “Effective lobbying,” as

Wolpe rightly suggests, “in its Washington (as opposed to its grassroots) dimension, is a function of interpersonal relations.”⁶⁴ Consequentially, there is, in a real sense, a constant stream of ideas and opinions flowing from a range of governmental actors within and toward Congress that can potentially determine policy or other legislative matters. Cognizant of this reality, lobbyists often focus their efforts on building allies with any person or group with sufficient access to lawmakers to ensure their interests are safeguarded and advanced. Nonetheless, the fact remains that the end goal of all their exertions is directed at influencing Congress and shaping public policy to their advantage.

Effectively influencing lawmakers requires a considerable amount of deliberation on the part of lobbyists as to what strategies they will employ to successfully move senators or representatives to favorably act on their behalf. As Wolpe concisely describes it: “All lobbying on Capitol Hill begins and ends with the members whose support and votes are needed on any given issue. The singular prerequisite to a lobbyist’s success and effectiveness is understanding the members of Congress.”⁶⁵ Through meticulous exertion directed toward understanding the psychological profile of legislators, lobbyists are acknowledged to create and employ strategies that exploit any apparent interests, ideals, or weaknesses of a given legislator. Additionally, Wolpe observes that:

In expressing themselves, legislators reveal their hopes, worldview, aspirations, frustrations, and objectives. They expose their character. ... And they disclose—by what they say—what they want to accomplish, and what is at stake, as they see it, in the legislative process. Once a member of Congress is understood in these terms, a lobbyist can craft a strategy to enlist the legislator’s support or neutralize his or her potential opposition.⁶⁶

Thus, the first and primary objective of any lobbyist is to understand the mind and motivations of a given legislator targeted. Secondly, it is to formulate a strategy that will make him or her amenable to their proposed policy positions.

In review, lobbying’s most fundamental characteristic is the wielding of influence with the hope that it results in predetermined policy outcomes. Next, contemporary lobbying expenditures will be evaluated.

Lobbying Expenditures

Lobby groups expend tremendous amounts of cash yearly to formulate and implement strategies necessary to achieve legislative victories. The Center for Responsive Politics estimated that in 2015 interest groups spent a combined total of \$3.2 billion on their lobby activities in Washington, D.C.⁶⁷ The Center for Responsive Politics' data also reveals a clear historical trend in lobbying expenditures between 1989 and 2015. Starting with \$1.45 billion in outlays in 1989, there were annual incremental increases in the shared number of lobby expenditures, eventually leveling off by 2008 at levels on par with the 2015 level of expenditure above-mentioned.⁶⁸ During this 26-year period, however, it is estimated that the aggregate cost of interest groups' spending to influence policymakers in Washington, D.C., was a notable \$46.79 billion.⁶⁹

As of 2020, there are over 11,500 registered lobbyists.⁷⁰ According to a 2017 report published in *The Hill* entitled, "Lobbying's top 50: Who's spending big," Wilson reveals that, in 2016, "Fifty companies and industry groups shelled out more than \$716 million to lobby the federal government... The five biggest spenders in lobbying last year, in descending order, were the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Realtors, Blue Cross Blue Shield, the American Hospital Association and the Pharmaceutical Research & Manufacturers of America."⁷¹ Some of the more recognized names on that list include: "Boeing, AT&T, Alphabet, Lockheed Martin, FedEx, Exxon Mobile, Amazon, Microsoft, and Facebook."⁷²

"Efforts by religious groups to influence U.S. public policy are a multimillion-dollar endeavor," Hertzke confirms.⁷³ However, their expenditures pale in comparison to corporate and business special interest spending. Data reveals between 2008-2009 the average annual expenditures of 129 religious lobbies identified totaled nearly \$350 million; the annual spending on lobbying—secular and religious—during that same timeframe was approximately \$3.5 billion.⁷⁴ Furthermore in 2008, close to \$88 million (24 percent) of the annual \$350 million expended by the religious lobbies were paid for by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) to influence Congress.⁷⁵ An additional \$82 million of the annual \$350 million average between those years was spent by seven other religious lobby organizations.⁷⁶

While these figures are startling, corporate and business lobbies are by far the largest subgroup in the United States amongst monetary outliers in the exercise of

influence over legislators; their exorbitant expenditures in this area clearly result in their successful navigation of the political process in Washington which secures numerous legislative advantages. The subsequent section details the two major strategies special interest lobbies implement to influence Congress.

Grass Roots Lobbying and Direct Lobbying Defined

The two chief outlays for this vast sum of money are in support of either direct or grass roots lobbying activities. These two forms of federal lobbying strategies are distinct, as “Direct lobbying refers to attempts to influence a legislative body through communication with a member or employee of a legislative body, or with a government official who participates in formulating legislation.”⁷⁷ While on the other hand, “Grass roots lobbying refers to attempts to influence legislation by attempting to affect the opinion of the public with respect to the legislation and encouraging the audience to take action with respect to the legislation. In either case, the communications must refer to and reflect a view on the legislation.”⁷⁸

Direct lobbying activities involve direct communication with legislators, articulating a lobbyist’s interests or position as it relates to specific pieces of legislation. This occurs either in the form of written communication or face-to-face meetings with Congressional members and/or their staff.⁷⁹ Grass roots lobbying activities, however, take shape in the form of public pressure campaigns organized by lobbyists that stimulate mass political engagement of a targeted constituency, specifically through information dissemination. The sole aim of spreading policy-related communication is to inspire the public to act civically by expressing their support for or disapproval of legislation. This method of communication is expressed in a vernacular that clarifies the legislative agenda in understandable terms to the targeted constituency. Goldstein expounds on the rationale behind grass roots lobbying activities as follows:

“The logic of grass roots lobbying decisions is rooted in the logic of congressional elections and congressional decision making. More precisely, the informational needs of voters and legislators provide strategic opportunities for lobbyists to influence both electoral and policy battles. Grass roots lobbying is a way for interest groups to provide information to voters and legislators that can influence election outcomes or the fate of a particular piece of legislation.”⁸⁰

Fundamentally, the primary aim of grass roots lobbying is attaining the support of members of the public in an effort to pass or defeat legislation in Congress; the accompanying underlying impetus, as well as the simultaneous threat, is that if members of Congress adopt a countervailing position, such a stance may negatively impact their reelection chances. Therefore, with enough public pressure, especially amongst their constituencies, elected officials are forced into a position where siding with lobbyists may determine the longevity, or brevity, of their political career.⁸¹

An array of strategies is employed to put grass roots pressure on members of Congress. According to Caldeira, Hojnacki, and Wright, “The techniques of modern lobbying provide organized interests a variety of tactical options. Alone or in coalition, groups can conduct research, alert their members, organize letter-writing and telephone call-in campaigns, contact legislators through lobbyists, distribute information to the media, purchase advertising, and more.”⁸² In addition to these tactics, lobbyists organize social media campaigns. The Internet via social media is viewed as a particularly viable means of putting pressure on politicians. “There have been numerous...examples of advocacy groups using the Internet to pursue collective action efforts,” confirm Obar, Zube and Lampe.⁸³ Moreover, grass roots lobbying encompasses both coalition-building with institutions of converging policy interests, and grass tops strategies. As it relates to the latter, grass tops strategies are directed at eliciting the assistance of influential contacts “who, by position or title, are strategically placed to provide political influence.”⁸⁴ Such actors include individuals wielding broad influence among the electorate of a given legislator, or individuals who have interests in the policy-related matter with direct or potential ties to the member of Congress.

Offensive and Defensive Lobbying Tactics

Two main divisions can further characterize lobbyists’ direct or grass roots lobbying activities, specifically as it relates to their tactical approaches in influencing legislators. They are either offensive or defensive in nature.⁸⁵ The offensive tactics are realized in certain proactive lobbying activities employed by lobbyists; for example, in lobbying efforts initiated in the support of the drafting of or backing of legislation favorable to their interests. Then there are tactics that are distinctly defensive in nature. Such defensive maneuvers are manifest in activities designed to halt, terminate, or reverse legislation damaging to lobbyists’ interests. In either case—offensive or

defensive—lobbyists may employ any of the myriad of the foregoing political pressure maneuvers to secure their interests. In practice, they target one legislator after another seeking to gain support for legislation the lobbyists aim to have codified into law.

Empirical evidence abounds, detailing historical examples of lobbyists' full engagement within the offensive characterization of lobbying. To specify, these strategies are typically exhibited by lobbyists' support of policies they have conceived, initiated, and worked for passage of with the assistance of Congress and the administration. A lucid historical example of this type of characterization is evident in what transpired after World War II in regards to agricultural policy that, in fact, determined farming outputs in the late 1940s and early 1950s.⁸⁶ According to Hansen, "In the thirties and forties, the American Farm Bureau Federation was a major player in national politics and the preeminent player in agricultural affairs."⁸⁷ Their influence was particularly evident in the passage of the "Hope-Aiken Act" of 1948.⁸⁸ Although the Truman Administration spearheaded this legislation, the farm industry played a major role in shaping the legislation from its very beginning.⁸⁹ "In October 1947, after months of study and consultation with farm organization leaders, Agriculture Secretary Clinton P. Anderson unveiled a long-range farm plan," Hansen confirms.⁹⁰ Furthermore, he states, "The Truman proposal was closely in agreement with the thinking of the new leadership of the American Farm Bureau".⁹¹

This historical example of the Hope-Aiken Act of 1948, and the American Farm Bureau's role in its passage, epitomizes the essence of the offensive lobbying classification. In such cases, interest groups are not passive in their approach of securing their legislative aims; actually, they are identified as the chief instigators of the process of policy formation with Congress and the Administration following their lead. It is important to note, lobbyists who engage offensively are not necessarily conducting their activities in the public purview as was the case in the Hope-Aiken illustration. Nevertheless, there remains ample empirical evidence of lobbyists utilizing such proactive measures to secure policy objectives.⁹²

There is also a multitude of historical examples of interest groups, and their respective lobbyists, adopting a defensive posture; consequently, lobbying against policies detrimental to their interests. Whether in their early stages of formation or already concretized into law, policies that compete with key interests are targeted by these groups for reversal and/or termination. There are countless illustrations of conspicuously harmful legislation serving as a catalyst for lobbyists' political action;

these threats immediately ignite direct or grass roots strategies on the part of lobbyists to counter them. On the other hand, there are instances when ostensibly nonthreatening legislation is up for Congressional consideration (or even passed into law) and a certain unforeseen negative effect arises that threatens the interests of lobbyists. It is in these instances that these political actors work feverishly to overturn or kill the legislation or law.

An illustration worth consideration is that of a law that was overtly damaging to the banking industry, subsequently forcing a defensive lobbying strategy on the industry's part in 1992. During that year, the banking industry heavily lobbied against reversing a bill that was already signed into law that would in effect: "withhold taxes on interest from bank accounts and dividends from securities."⁹³ This one policy move would essentially cost the industry billions of dollars in lost revenue.⁹⁴ "Fearful ... of the multibillion-dollar cost of enforcing the law," Goldstein emphasizes, "the banking industry dropped 'the hydrogen bomb of modern day lobbying, an effort whose firepower was awesome, whose carnage was staggering. In one fell swoop down went the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, down went the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, down went the Secretary of the Treasury, down went the president of the United States.'"⁹⁵ The enormous grassroots pressure the banking industry exerted on Congress, particularly through its savvy use of the media and other mass mobilizations tactics, ultimately led to a vote that reversed the specified legislation, and forced politicians out of office.⁹⁶

A clear demonstration of defensive lobbying against a seemingly nonthreatening piece of legislation, which in effect proved detrimental to lobbyists' interests, is demonstrated in lobbying activities to halt a bill supporting religious freedom that was introduced by Congress in 1997.⁹⁷ Congress had proposed legislation that would "place sanctions on countries that persecuted religious minorities".⁹⁸ Prima facie consideration suggested—particularly in light of the fact that the U.S. Constitution protects religious freedom for its own citizens—a bill such as this, supporting religious minorities against oppression, should not have any difficulty passing both the House and the Senate.⁹⁹ However, the bill faced a tidal wave of opposition, taking drafters and supporters of the legislation by surprise.¹⁰⁰ The catalyst and common denominator that assisted in the aggregation of a formidable lobby against the bill—which consisted of "twelve trade associations, including the Newspaper Association of America, the Nonprescription Drug Manufacturers Association, the National Food Processors

Association, and the National Soft Drink Association”—originated in the group’s common interest in a specific natural resource primarily found in Sudan, a country that would certainly face sanctions if legislation passed.¹⁰¹ According to Hula, “Gum arabic is a naturally occurring substance derived from the acacia tree that is used in many food products, cosmetics, newspaper printing and other everyday items. The problem that mobilized the coalition is that between 70 and 90 percent of the world’s supply of gum arabic comes from Sudan”.¹⁰² Subsequently, after the implementation of a highly effective lobbying strategy that generated substantial pressure from this diverse coalition, an alternative compromise was reached when, “President Clinton preempted legislative action in November of 1997 by issuing an executive order banning trade with Sudan. While freezing Sudan’s assets in the United States and banning American investment in Sudan, the order expressly noted that licenses might be issued for the importation of products like gum arabic, for which there were no other sources.”¹⁰³

In both historical illustrations, the concept of defensive lobbying is articulated. In sum, this characterization focuses on the reactive typology within lobbying strategies. In such cases, lobbyists are not the initiators or political provocateurs of legislation; they are political contesters, countering any legislation set in motion that jeopardizes their vital interests. Ultimately, there is an intensity of lobbying exertions designed to preserve and protect their politico-economic advantages.

Furthermore, the illustrations reviewed above highlighting both offensive and defensive tactics, specifically by various business lobbies, point to the dominant motivating factor for secular lobbying activities—self-interest. Let us now consider what role self-interest plays in the context of this form of lobbying.

Lobbying and Self-Interests

Categorically, secular lobbying’s principal characteristic and chief impetus, as demarcated, is the advancement of self/group interest in any governmental legislative chamber or agency, where policies are being formulated to impact or advance those interests. This guiding precept of self-interest, coupled with certain exacting measures employed to achieve legislative victories at any cost, have led select members of Congress to conclude that lobbying at its basic core is no more than “‘implying the power of threat or the use of bribery’ . . . [and] that ‘any effort to substitute for the public interest a private interest should be brought within the definition.’”¹⁰⁴ Members

further assert, “The lobbyist . . . ‘is a man who tries to induce the legislator to forget temporarily all the people and to do something that will promote the fortunes of a single citizen or a group of citizens.’”¹⁰⁵ Embedded within this assertion is the enduring historical tension of special interest groups’ legislative objectives being squarely in opposition to legislators’ principal public mandate of pursuing the common good¹⁰⁶ of the nation. Thus, the principal point of contention rests decisively on the fact that certain private interests are fundamentally at variance with the public’s concerns. Nonetheless, legislators often pursue and adopt such private interests as a direct result of the tremendous amount of pressure exerted upon them by lobbyists who have at their disposal vast sums wealth. This results in the failure of legislation that—if otherwise passed—would have secured greater equality of opportunity; provided better economic supports for the larger body citizens; and thus strengthened the fraternal bonds of the nation. Instead, as Logan and Fellow conclude, interest groups can be “held responsible for much of the legislation which is not enacted in the public interest.”¹⁰⁷

The motivational factor of self-interest in corporate and business lobbying is a basic and vital distinction between their activities and the promulgated impetuses driving the work of CLOs. This distinction will be expounded upon further in the coming chapters.

Lobbying Theories

The struggle between legislating for the common good as opposed to legislating to mollify the tidal waves of special interests—as well as avoid the latent exactions that potentially follow due to noncompliance—continues to inspire a lively and longstanding debate amongst legislators and scholars regarding the nature of lobbying and the impact of lobbying activities upon the U.S. body politic. In fact, underlying theories abound on this subject. In an article entitled, “The Business of America is Lobbying: Explaining the Growth of Corporate Political Activity in Washington, DC,” John Hopkins’s University professor Lee Drutman highlights multiple theories that seek to explain the general propositions of corporate lobbying activities. In that work he explicates, “In order to understand why companies behave as they do politically, it helps to have a general theory of how firms operate. There are many theories of the firm in literature ranging from sociology to strategic management to economics. Four main theories of the firm will be helpful as a baseline: 1) Neoclassical; 2) Behavioral;

3) Resource-based; and 4) Agent-based.”¹⁰⁸ In a separate article, Drutman details, “The literature on lobbying offers three main theories of what lobbying is primarily about: (1) It is a quid pro quo exchange process; (2) it is about working with allies; and (3) it is about providing expert information and using that information.”¹⁰⁹ These theoretical positions are merely a brief sampling of a range of theories scholars suggest are fundamental to understanding as a lobbying phenomenon.¹¹⁰ For the purposes of this study, however, two of the stated theories are most relevant to the discussion—*quid pro exchange process* and *providing expert information and using that information*.

Specifically as it relates to the first theoretical position, Drutman clarifies: “One way of thinking views interest group influence as an exchange process in which members of Congress agree to support legislation and advocate for certain special interests in exchange for electoral support from those special interests, primarily in the form of campaign contributions.”¹¹¹ This theory asserts that lobbying’s most fundamental characteristic is a reciprocity of self-interests between a legislator and a lobbyist. The mutual exchange of wanted benefits on the sides of each political actor involved determines the nature of the compromise. Consequently, in such a legal framework, where this kind of recompense is permissible, one effect is that lobbyists gain support for favorable legislation; and the second is that these same lobbyists are thereby *de facto* central determinants—not only as to what legislation is passed, but in determining whose election or reelection chances are most viable as well. In the end, they coopt the reins of government. This kind of purported influence upon both the legislative and electoral processes demonstrates why proponents of this theory frequently refer to interest groups¹¹² as the, “‘Third House,’ or the ‘Assistant Government,’ or again the ‘Invisible Government.’”¹¹³

As one of the foremost theories on lobbying, quid pro quo exchange process seeks to analyze the legitimacy of these presuppositions, and their real or imagined impact upon the political order. While many political scientists, sociologists, historians, and legislators confirm the soundness of this theory; there are other intellectuals who conclude it is tenuous at best. Such deductions are often based on certain “non-findings” prevalent in empirical surveys of Congressional offices. Drutman makes this claim and argues: “I encountered no first-hand evidence to support this theory. There was not a single meeting that I held in which I was told ahead of time or afterwards that this particular group was an important campaign contributor.”¹¹⁴ The underlying conjecture maintained here is that members of Congress, or their staff, will readily disclose that

votes in support of legislation lobbied for by certain interest groups are based on conditionality of campaign contributions or electoral support. This line of reasoning, which bases the legitimacy of the quid pro quo exchange process theory solely upon the verbal verification of Congressional staff to prove its veracity, is by far an inadequate approach in determining this theory's accuracy. Instead, investigation into the legislation interest groups lobbied for (that was actually adopted by a particular Congressional office), complimented by a meticulous analysis of that office's campaign contributions and its sources, as well as identifying the demographics of voter support for the respective member of Congress, is certainly a more appropriate scientific method to determine the legitimacy of this theory's claims. However, this method's effectiveness is also contingent on a certain level of transparency on the part of Congressional offices that may prove to be unattainable because of their unwillingness to disclose relevant information.

Nevertheless, the key to examining the soundness of quid pro quo exchange process as a theory is found in a basic understanding of the mechanisms of representative democracy. Essentially, representative democracy is based upon a quid pro quo relationship of exchange: politicians receive votes from their respective electorates with expectation that the representative, while serving in government, will pursue the electorates' interests. Unquestionably, this type of political relationship is based upon a fixed reciprocity, where the casting of one's vote comes with certain policy expectancies. Furthermore, when those expectancies do not materialize—as history repeatedly corroborates—voters exercise their legal right to cast their votes for candidates who promise to pursue their interests.

Similarly, campaign donations are vital to a candidate's election or reelection chances, particularly in the current legal configuration of how political contests are conducted. It is groundless to assume that such donations come without certain conditions, expectations, or restrictions. In fact, individual or group contributions are accompanied with a broad public recognition that such support entails the sharing of certain political opinions between benefactors and their preferred candidates. Hence, donations are made with the anticipation that after election the legislative pursuits of policymakers will reflect those initial views that justified the donations. As it is in the case of votes cast, so it is in the case of financial contributions given; thus, when elected officials do not meet the political aims of their financial supporters, that support is withdrawn. Such a quid pro quo relationship of exchange between elected officials and

their supporters is an abiding norm, and is most fundamental to the basic mechanics of U.S. representative democracy.

Lobbyists are aware of this fact. They have historically exploited this rudimentary political pattern to promote their own interests by utilizing their wealth as the primary means of establishing and maintaining their influence over legislators, essentially appropriating unto themselves the electorates' democratic right to have a "government of the people, by the people, for the people".¹¹⁵ In effect, lobbyists who are able to assert enough influence through their inducements, appropriate unto themselves the role of 'the people' whose common good is ultimately undermined. Mayer supports the notion that incentives which secure legislative favors for lobbyists include, and are not limited to, financial and electoral support mentioned. He writes,

"Interest groups also provide needed campaign financing and reelection support such as individual and bundled campaign contributions, campaign volunteers, campaign-related advertising, and voter mobilization efforts—not to mention wielding the threat of electoral opposition. Finally, interest groups also have historically sought to appeal to less high-minded personal preferences by providing lavish gifts, lucrative honoraria, desirable social connections, comfortable post-government service positions, and even pleasant companionship."¹¹⁶

The corresponding scientific data that best supports these claims, while simultaneously reinforcing quid pro quo exchange process theory as an accurate theoretical exposition on this subject, is disclosed in the various court proceedings that have come into the public purview exposing the illegal activities of lobbyists. These cases reveal how lobbyists secure legislative advantages as a direct result of some purported mutually favorable exchange.

A prime example is that of Jack Abramoff, a well-known Washington lobbyist, who was convicted and served time in prison because of certain improprieties on Capitol Hill during the 1990s. "The mere mention of Jack Abramoff's name," Mayers asserts, "is enough to conjure up images of back-room meetings, illicit campaign contributions, and other shadowy dealings that undermine democracy."¹¹⁷ In the Washington Post, Schmidt and Grimaldi reporting on the Abramoff corruption case write: "Former Republican congressman Mickey Edwards (Okla.), usually a defender of lobbying and Congress, said there have always been members who get caught 'stuffing money in their pants.' But he said this is different—a 'disgusting' and disturbingly broad scandal driven by lobbyists whose attitude seemed to be

‘government to the highest bidder.’”¹¹⁸ Such scandals expose a side to lobbying rarely witnessed by the public or admitted by Congressional offices.

Additionally, this historical pattern of engagement between lobbyists and legislators has led to all sorts of regulations designed to curb this corrupt behavior. According to Mayer,

“One way Congress regulates lobbying is to increase its cost by barring individuals and entities from deducting lobbying expenditures in most instances. A second way is to require public disclosure of information about lobbying activities and sources of funds for lobbying, although the exact extent of disclosure that Congress may constitutionally require remains uncertain. Third, and finally, Congress restricts interactions between government officials and lobbyists that go beyond mere speech. Such restrictions include not only prohibiting outright bribery but also placing limitations on gifts and travel that government officials may receive and placing restrictions on former government officials engaging in lobbying.”¹¹⁹

These regulations specifically seek to address the illegal aspects of a quid pro quo relationship of exchange between certain legislators and lobbyists that must be curtailed in the interest of the common good. Mansbridge agrees, “that the oligopolistic power of certain interest groups must be regulated to prevent distortions of the legislative process.”¹²⁰ Consequentially, the quid pro quo exchange process is more than an unfounded theoretical pedantic; it is a valid and essential theoretical paradigm to view lobbying in Washington, as clear historical evidence substantiates.

One the other hand, to assume all lobbyists’ primary aim is to engage in and benefit from a quid pro quo process of exchange as described above is to not fully consider the actual diversity of interest groups lobbying on Capitol Hill. As cursory inquiry into lobbying groups in Washington reveals, “The range of organized political interests in the United States is fully as broad and diverse as the economic and social concerns of the nation itself.”¹²¹ Bearing this fact in mind, a precise categorization of interest groups is undoubtedly a complicated task considering the plethora of respective organizational visions, missions, and values. Nevertheless, Wright attempts to delineate a range of categories. He suggests essentially that most, if not all, fall within one of the following classifications: “Trade and professional associations; corporations; labor unions; citizen groups; state and local governmental organizations; [and] religious, charitable, and community groups.”¹²² Considering such a sundry of groupings, and motivations for lobbying, the second leading theory on lobbying worthy of

consideration is the concept of “information transmission.”¹²³ Undeniably, this is something all these bodies engage in.

Research by Bertrand, Bombardini, and Trebbi supports this claim: “A large part of the academic theoretical literature on interest groups has painted the lobbying process as one of information transmission: informed interest groups send cheap or costly signals to uninformed politicians.”¹²⁴ Drutman expounds further: “[This] view is that lobbying is primarily about persuasion by information transmission. Hansen (1991) describes lobbying as primarily engaged in providing information about constituency views, with groups pressing lawmakers to enact particular policies based on how constituents will respond.”¹²⁵ Subsequently, this theoretical position suggests that lobbyists’ primary function is assisting legislators in comprehending the details and complexities of a particular issue by providing expert information. Additionally, lobbyists notify legislators of the electorates’ support or opposition to the policy issue of concern. Thus, as Austin-Smith and Wright suggest, proponents of this theory “conceptualize lobbying as a two-stage process in which the first stage involves the acquisition of specialized information, and the second involves the strategic communication of a message to the legislator concerning this information.”¹²⁶

Though information transmission as a theory serves as a leading concept in apprehending lobbying activities by interest groups in Washington, D.C., it should not be inferred that in its case certain quid pro quo elements of exchange are absent. In fact, studies suggest otherwise. Scholars confirm that when such information is acted upon, in the sense that policymakers use it to shape legislation in alignment with the requests of the interest groups involved; what correspondingly results is a favorable opinion amongst the policymaker’s electorate. “Wright offers,” as Drutman verifies, “a similar view, arguing that interest groups ‘achieve influence through the acquisition of and strategic transmission of information that legislators need to make good public policy and get reelected.’”¹²⁷

In the case of CLOs, both theories—quid pro quo process of exchange and information transmission—are relevant and applicable, particularly as expressed by Wright in his latter proposition. To further clarify, CLOs provide relevant information to legislators about policy positions; their backing results in receiving electoral support from members of these organizations. Clearly, a relationship of reciprocity is established. However, a distinguishing factor is the purported rationale driving CLOs lobby activities. Neither theory adequately captures the nuanced psychological or

spiritual factors driving lobbyists' engagement in lobbying. In the case of corporate and business lobbies, as stated, self-interest is central, while CLOs claim a spiritual factor as the predominant compulsion. Within the realm of political science, a theory that analyzes the spiritual dimension of lobbying is, without surprise, conspicuously absent. In the following chapters, this theme of constructing and appropriating a spiritual theoretical position to lobbying will be revisited in greater detail.

In summary, as a political phenomenon, lobbying is a legal—and in many political actors' opinion—viable means to influence Congress to achieve public policy objectives most in consonance with one's socio-economic aspirations. As highlighted in the foregoing sections, some of these special interest groups are willing to expend enormous sums of capital to implement various lobbying strategies that lead to legislative victories. Additionally, the theories reviewed assist in understanding the general propositions of lobbying as a political practice in the contemporary. At this point, it is imperative to investigate the historical emergence of lobbying as a constitutionally protected right in the context of the United States. This will provide a clearer picture of how lobbying, in all its contemporary forms, took shape.

A History of Lobbying in the United States

A well-known journalist once concluded, “America is no longer a nation. It is a committee of lobbies.”¹²⁸ Whether this statement is factual is certainly up for debate. Nonetheless, what is key for this study is the inference being made: that is, lobbyists are recognized as having an exorbitant amount of influence within the body politic of the United States of America. Certainly, the facts highlighted in the previous sections confirm this contemporary reality. However, lobbying is certainly not a new phenomenon. “Lobbying has been recognized” as one scholar suggests, “as a legitimate, protected activity from the earliest years of the United States. The First Amendment to the Constitution provided that ‘Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition government for redress of grievances.’”¹²⁹ However, prior to the early nineteenth century, the terms ‘lobbying’ or ‘lobbyists’ were not commonly used to describe the activities and agents that employed this political approach to influence public policy. Rather, these terms were adopted at a later date. “By 1829”, as one scholar suggests, “the phrase *lobby-agents* was being applied to special favor-

seekers hovering the New York Capitol lobby at Albany. By 1832 the term had been shortened to lobbyist and was in wide use at the U.S. Capitol.”¹³⁰ Although the term *lobbying* did not emerge until the early nineteenth century, this political strategy is older than the United States’ federal government itself.

Since the drafting of the U.S. Declaration of Independence, “factions”¹³¹ with particular public policy interests existed. These factions represented powerful interests that sought to impose upon policymakers their weight of influence by lobbying for legislation most favorable to their politico-economic ambitions. In their groundbreaking study, *Lobbying in America*, Hrebenar and Morgan write: “Following the American War of Independence (1776-1783), the new American nation operated under a pre-Constitution document called the Articles of Confederation. Interest group politics among the 13 newly independent former colonies (now states) was mostly conducted on the state level...”¹³² Consequently, the emergence of interest group politics at the level of specific colonial governments was categorically antecedent to federal strategies that were forthcoming, perceptibly because the federal system at this period was in its early stages of development. By this stage, the impact of these political actors upon the common good of American society was nonetheless heavily debated. Thus, as the Founding Fathers of the burgeoning nation sought to shape its sovereign identity—and coalesce the constitutional union between the 13 states—the nature, impact, and proper function of these groups upon the body politic were all under consideration.

James Madison, the primary architect of the U.S. Constitution, concluded that such factions posed a real danger to the common good of American society.¹³³ On November 23, 1787, in his celebrated communiqué, “Federalist No. 10,” in thoughtful detail he outlined his trepidations concerning their impact upon the nation. Madison firmly asserts that “the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority.”¹³⁴ He further explicates, “By a faction, I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.”¹³⁵ Consequently, the resulting cacophonous clamor of factions—whose group behavior clearly demonstrated an inexorable quest to accrue certain privileges and advantages

exclusively unto themselves—did not only inherently foster divisions within society; they also sacrificed on the altar of sectarian gain the loftier ideals essential to preserving social harmony in the nation. Thus, what was lucidly clear for that first generation of U.S. political leadership was that factions would spare no expense in obtaining their politico-economic objectives even if that meant forgoing the common good.

As one political scientist of prominence candidly notes, “politics is the allocation of governmental resources; it is who gets what, when, where, why and how.”¹³⁶ Indubitably, during the infancy stage of the new nation, these early interest groups were determined to ensure their liberal share of the American pie. Madison, cognizant of this political truism—underscoring the role of government in the distribution of national resources—concludes that the primary source of all factions, and the discord they produce in society is essentially the apportionment of “property.”¹³⁷ To clarify, in “Federalist No. 10” Madison asserts, “the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination.”¹³⁸

Private property, as a hallowed principle in western civilization with an almost universal predilection in the minds of men and women, has—as a socioeconomic aspiration—often birthed division and even ruin amongst peoples and nations. Such thinking was not uncommon amongst philosophical and political scientists of that century. “Private property,” Jean Jacques Rousseau, “asserted in his *Second Discourse* was the principal source of that form of unnatural inequality which gives rise to governments, rulers, and violence.

The first man who having enclosed a piece of ground, to whom it occurred to say *this is mine* and found people sufficiently simple to believe him, was the true founder of civil society. How many crimes, wars, murders, how many miseries and horrors mankind would have been spared by him who, pulling up the stakes or filling in the ditch, had cried out to his kind: Beware of listening to this imposter. You are lost if you forget that the fruits are everyone’s and the earth no-one’s.”¹³⁹

To emphasize, ultimately for Madison it is this struggle for property between competing factions that presented an existential threat to the common good, and the union of states if not mitigated. In considering the complexity of transcending this problem Madison pens: “The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of

property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests.”¹⁴⁰ He goes on to suggest, “The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties.” For Madison these divisions were insurmountable; hence, their precarious result upon the body politic demanded neutralization for the wellbeing of society. The fundamental question he faced was exactly how to do this?

Madison vacillated between the idea of eliminating the *causes* of factions, on the one hand, or controlling their *effects*, on the other.¹⁴¹ Regarding the former, Madison resolves that for a nation founded on the principles of liberty such an option as prohibiting factions or outlawing their lobbying activities was in praxis unrealistic; more fundamentally, it violated liberty as a natural right.¹⁴² He held the view that a nation thrives best when a diversity of ideas are maintained, cultivated and safeguarded; even if this leads to a latent and deleterious impact upon the state by competing parties. Berry further delves into this complication and clarifies, “The dilemma is this: If government does not allow people to pursue their self-interest, it takes away their political freedom. When we look at the nations of the world in which people are forbidden to organize and to freely express their political views, we find that there the dilemma has been solved by authoritarianism.”¹⁴³ Thus regarding this dilemma Madison concludes, “that the *causes* of faction cannot be removed, and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its *effects*.”¹⁴⁴

To control the *effects* of factions, Madison argues for representative government. “A republic,” he contends, “by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect, and promises the cure for which we are seeking.”¹⁴⁵ In fact, the republic he argues for practiced certain controlled democratic principles but was ultimately representative in nature, and bound to the higher tenets of a constitution.¹⁴⁶ Essential to this proposed governmental structure were enlightened men of noble character who would contest for public office. In describing this form of representational democracy that would provide the desired effect in controlling the dangers factions posed, Madison suggests, “The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern

the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations.”¹⁴⁷ This type of statesperson willing to pursue the common good above personal interests was the ideal salutary proposition amongst politicians of that era. Thomas Jefferson during his first inaugural address echoes the sentiments of Madison when he affirms, “..., all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and united in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression.”¹⁴⁸ Notwithstanding the opinions of Jefferson and Madison, the fact remains that there exists certain facets of human nature that are impossible for elected officials to transcend; thus impeding their efforts to pursue the common good. Madison also foresaw this difficulty and argues that in such cases when politicians disregard the common good the electorate serves as the principal means to hold them accountable.¹⁴⁹ By ensuring term limits, the citizenry is afforded the option to participate democratically in selecting representatives whose ideas and policies most resonate with them.¹⁵⁰

Intricately linked to the above proposal is another proposed check in the balance of power to control the effect of factions upon government. It is mandating an adequate apportionment of elected representatives specifically in proportion to the overall number of the populace.¹⁵¹ Madison asserts the number of individuals elected to public office should not be so minimal so as to prevent factions from controlling the few that are elected; additionally, the number should not be so numerous so as to prevent the government from being controlled by the erratic inclinations of the masses.¹⁵² Berry succinctly outlines Madison’s designs in the following terms:

In Madison’s mind, a republican form of government, as designed by the framers, would provide the necessary checks on the worst impulses of factions. A republican form of government gives responsibility for decisions to a small number of representatives who are elected by the larger citizenry. Furthermore, for a government whose authority extends over a large and dispersed population, the effects of faction would be diluted by the clash of competing interests across the country. Thus, Madison believed that in a land as large as the United States, so many interests would arise that a representative government with its own checks and balances would not become dominated by any faction. Instead, government could deal with the views of all, producing policies that would be in the common good.¹⁵³

In hindsight, specifically considering the historical and contemporary influence of interest groups in shaping government policy, it is debatable whether Madison's presumptions and interventions were accurate or not. Nevertheless, in this particular political contrivance Madison sought to achieve the primary aim of sustaining the necessary checks and balances to control the effects of factions upon the state, while simultaneously preserving the liberty that is vital to a democratic society. Therefore, as a principal architect of the U.S. Constitution, Madison embeds within it the legal framework for factions, or interest groups as we have come to know them today, to exist and petition Congress. As Mayer correctly notes: "It [lobbying] is protected by the First Amendment right to petition the government for redress and by similar provisions in numerous state constitutions."

The origin of lobbying as a political practice in the United States can be traced back to the early formation of the nation as a sovereign political actor. Unquestionably, the activities identified as lobbying by factions during the late eighteenth century helped shape the political, economic, and social character of the United States. As shown, this is a direct result of the deliberations that led to it becoming a constitutional right codified into the basic laws of the nation which allows individuals or groups to pursue their political aims unobstructed by the means of lobbying. It stands to reason that these actors who engaged in this activity from the onset of the nation represented a broad range of groups and interests, including ecclesiastical. In the next section, the early engagement of diverse ecclesiastical bodies as they sought to influence governmental policy in the United States will be explored.

A Brief History of Ecclesiastical Political Influence in Colonial America

The historical account of what led to the emergence of what today is identified as lobbying—specifically, as a viable and favored political strategy by ecclesiastical bodies in the context of early American history—is as distinct as the Christian traditions that populated the Thirteen Colonies during the eighteenth century. Yet, like secular factions, ecclesiastical bodies were since the nations' inception actively engaged in influencing public policy through similar efforts. The distinctiveness of their participation, however, rested primarily in their expressed impetus to engage politically. The earliest historical accounts of church bodies' lobbying efforts in the United States reveal such groups' viewed lobbying as a practical means to express their

deepest held religious convictions. Inspired by certain theological underpinnings or biblical interpretations,¹⁵⁴ such religious groups concluded they could not relegate their Christian witness solely to spiritual practices, or to charitable acts alone within the social realm, while remaining disengaged from the political sphere. In fact, many of these groups' convictions gave rise to lobbying as a public expression of their Christian faith; it served as an ideal type of mercy ministry suitable for the democratic context in which they found themselves. Consequently, their voices, penned and spoken, were used as instruments to secure rights and privileges for the disenfranchised, oppressed, enslaved, and even for themselves.¹⁵⁵

As will be investigated, although numerous examples of early Christian lobbying efforts were essentially purported as grounded in altruistic Christian service, it is important to note that self-interest was certainly not detached from their efforts. Self-interest clearly played a key factor. Unequivocally, certain lobbying activities were set in motion to benefit church bodies as a means to secure privileges, benefits, or rights for the respective denominational body engaged in the lobbying. For example, even an ostensibly selfless objective like petitioning political leadership to protect religious liberty for all American citizens was not purely altruistic in the sense that the primary beneficiaries of such an assurance were the minority Christian groups engaged in lobbying; thus, directly benefiting from this policy.¹⁵⁶

The range of sociopolitical issues for these early ecclesiastical bodies engaged in lobbying also varied. And the assumption that there was accord, or even concord, when disparate church groups converged around a particular public policy matter was also not always the case. For example, policy issues concerning matters of church and state, abolition, or prohibition indeed held the attention of a variety of church groups' lobbying efforts, often with varying degrees of consensus amongst themselves. However, the contrary is also quite true. Some issues, specifically the issues of slavery and abolition, led to very contentious disagreements amongst various Christian groups.

A look at American colonial history reveals ecclesiastical bodies have played a significant role in shaping the political landscape of America in some manner since the first European settlers landed on its shores. "It must never be forgotten," Alex de Tocqueville argues in his classic work *Democracy in America*, "that religion gave birth to Anglo-American society."¹⁵⁷ During his travels throughout the United States, his observations led him to conclude that the social concept of equality was a primary driving force in American democracy. Concerning the foregoing he writes, "No

NOVELTY in the United States struck me more vividly during my stay there than the equality of condition... So the more I studied American society, the more clearly I saw equality of conditions as the creative element from which each particular fact derived, and all my observations constantly returned to this nodal point.”¹⁵⁸ Concerning the conceptual origin of this guiding principle in American society, he further observed that it cannot be divorced from the Judeo-Christian thought that influenced life in Europe for centuries.¹⁵⁹ Specifically, he traces the origin of this social principle rooted in American society all the way back to the emergence of the clergy as a political power in Europe.¹⁶⁰ Tocqueville succinctly explains it, “But then the political power of the clergy began to take shape and soon to extend. The ranks of the clergy were open to all, poor or rich, commoner or noble; through the church, equality began to insinuate itself into the heart of government, and a man who would have vegetated as a serf in eternal servitude could, as a priest, take his place among the nobles and often take precedence over kings.”¹⁶¹ This social construct, accompanied with the general growth of men of learning in European society, functioned as the catalyst that led to the questioning, and ultimately the overturning, of traditional systems of social hierarchy in Europe.¹⁶²

Consequently, the propagation of these ideals gained momentum as they consumed the minds of the people of that era; eventually serving as a fatal blow that contributed to the demise of feudalism. What is key here, however, is that Tocqueville largely attributes the rise and establishment of a general conceptual embrace of equality—within the minds of the European masses—to the church of Europe. To reiterate, it all originated with certain lower-class members of society entering the clergy and thus gaining access to higher social circles and government; they in effect transcended social castes that would have otherwise restricted any type of upward mobility.

Thus, in the context of early American colonial society, the immigration of certain groups of European settlers to the shores of America—who fully embraced equality as a God-ordained right—impelled this principle and assisted in it taking a firm hold on public consciousness. Tocqueville in support of this assertion divulges, during the earliest periods of colonialization, two distinct groups of Anglo-Saxons arrived to establish settlements in the New World.¹⁶³ The earliest group settled in Virginia and possessed a certain unscrupulous ambition for profiteering.¹⁶⁴ Frankly, their moral compass was aimed at generating wealth by exploiting both natural and human resources at any cost. Woefully, this cost constituted the subjugation, oppression, and

genocidal annihilation of large segments of the native population and the enslavement of Africa's children.

On the other hand, however, Tocqueville advances a second group of Anglo-Saxons settlers—the Puritans—as being the primary architects responsible for laying the foundation of the democratic system that is currently in effect in the United States. In his descriptive analysis of the origin of democracy in America, Tocqueville submits,

“The immigrants, or as they so well named themselves, the Pilgrims, belonged to that English sect whose austere principles had led them to be called Puritans. Puritanism was not just a religious doctrine; in many respects it shared the most absolute democratic and republican theories. That was the element that had aroused its most dangerous adversaries. Persecuted by the home government, and with their strict principles offended by the everyday ways of the society in which they lived, the Puritans sought a land so barbarous and neglected by the world that there at last they might be able to live in their own way and pray to God in freedom.”¹⁶⁵

Colonial America provided enough political freedom from the rule of the British monarchy that the Pilgrims felt at liberty to implement a socio-political experiment fashioned by their deepest held religious convictions. Convictions that professed: “The elected Christian is in the world only to increase this glory of God by fulfilling His commandments to the best of his ability. But God requires social achievement of the Christian because He wills that social life shall be organized according to His commandments, in accordance with that purpose. The social activity of the Christian in the world is solely activity in *majorem gloriam Dei*.”¹⁶⁶ In light of such a claim, it is unsurprising that, when the opportunity presented itself, Puritans embarked en masse upon the journey of faith and migrated to America—undoubtedly, to realize a socio-political order inspired by this pragmatic doctrinal viewpoint which sought to create a society of God's elect.

Preacher and revivalist Jonathan Edward elaborates further on Puritan opinion in regard to the discovery of America and the divine mandate they perceived related to it. “This new world,” Edward exhorts, “is probably now discovered, that the new and most glorious state of God's church on earth might commence there; that God might in it begin a new world in a spiritual respect, when he creates the new heavens and new earth.”¹⁶⁷ Edwards' appeal is lucid here; he emboldens his adherents to take part in what he considers a divine labor in establishing a church unparalleled in its glorification of God on earth. “And if we may suppose that this glorious work of God shall begin in any part of America,” he further commends, “I think, if we consider the circumstances

of the settlement of New England, it must needs appear the most likely, of all American colonies, to be the place whence this work shall principally take its rise.”¹⁶⁸ It is certainly up for debate whether or not this was Edward’s sole and unaffected motivation for urging Puritans to mass migrate to America. What is indisputable is that many did indeed embrace such a call.

In describing the arrival of the first Puritans on American shores, Tocqueville shares the following account: “The immigrants, including women and children, numbered about one hundred and fifty. Their object was to found a colony on the banks of the Hudson; but after long wondering over the ocean, they were finally forced to land on the arid coast of New England, on the spot where the town of Plymouth now stands.”¹⁶⁹ He continues,

“No sooner had the immigrants landed on that inhospitable coast described by Nathaniel Morton than they made it their first care to organize themselves as a society. They immediately passed an act which stated: ‘We whose names are underwritten . . . having undertaken for the glory of God, and the advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our king and country a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof, do enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.’ [Cf. Morton, *New England’s Memorial*, Boston, 1826, p.37 f.]”¹⁷⁰

Upon their arrival to American shores, the first sinews of American democracy took form with the Mayflower Compact; as Tocqueville also confirms: “Democracy more perfect than any of which antiquity had dared to dream sprang full-grown and fully armed from the midst of the old feudal society.”¹⁷¹

Additionally, at the birth of this burgeoning political order, there was a decisive theological convention that challenged the prevailing political power structure of European society. As one scholar of note suggests, “Puritan doctrine also helped to nurture self-government in the new land. Puritans articulated a ‘covenant theology’ that was a blatant rejection of the longstanding ‘divine right of kings’ doctrine. As the Puritans saw it, political leaders did not derive their authority directly from God; instead, Puritans favored a model of government based on a community’s covenant with God.”¹⁷² *Covenant theology*¹⁷³ as a doctrine enervated the idea of a solely

incontestable nobility. Alternatively, it was the impetus for achieving political self-determination within the context of the Christian community. In fact, the church viewed itself as instrument in the hand of God called to be active in shaping social and political institutions.

Locke's political thought¹⁷⁴ was considered for a time by scholars to be the central philosophical conceptualization that ultimately upended the old systems of governance in Europe and was the primary intellectual force behind the formation of the modern democratic state.¹⁷⁵ However, today scholars challenge this notion; instead, they argue the Puritans' arrival in America first realized the feat of instituting a functioning democratic model of governance in modern society. Goldie corroborates: "Locke was said to have filled the vacuum left by the collapse of the 'divine right of kings.' Modern scholarship has drastically revised this picture, such that Lockean political thought now seems a fugitive and elusive presence, at least before the 1760s."¹⁷⁶ Credibly, Lockean political thought articulated certain intellectual stimuli that helped shape the modern democratic state, including the American federal system. However, Puritanism's covenant theology as a theological construct—which clearly preceded Lockean thought—accomplished what the philosopher would hope for; it inspired men and women to a praxis that inaugurated and concretized a tangible expression of a governmental experiment based on the rule of the people. One may therefore conclude that covenant theology is the key intellectual construct upon which American democracy, and for that matter, all democracies are built.

Here it is important to note, the author does not view Puritan participation at this point in history as Christian lobbyism. This type of political relationship between the church and state is distinct from the latter. In reviewing the direct political engagement of the earliest Puritan settlers, a shift that results in church and state relations during the Revolutionary period is clearly demarcated. As Witte and Nicholas correspondingly suggest of Puritan political involvement in that era, "church and state were not to be confounded, they were still to be 'close and compact.'... The Puritans therefore countenanced both the coordination and the cooperation of church and state."¹⁷⁷ Later in United States' history a shift emerges.

Lastly, it is worth emphasizing that at the earliest developmental stages of colonial America's political identity—specifically at the state level—the Congregationalists of New England undeniably had significant influence in shaping governmental processes. This is particularly evident in the states of Connecticut, Maine,

Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Other states had their respective prevailing denominational influences like the Church of England's influence in Virginia, Georgia, and North and South Carolina; the Catholics' influence in Maryland; the Quakers' influence in Pennsylvania; the Anabaptists' influence in Rhode Island; and the Dutch Protestants' influence New York and New Jersey. Each state contrived a distinct legal framework to guide church and state relations within their respective jurisdictions.¹⁷⁸

As the earliest religious settlers, the Puritans' influence and impact upon government is noteworthy for this study. The convergence of time, coupled with the shifting winds of American political life, provided post-Declaration of Independence statesmen with the liberty to design a federal system of their choosing which in their end calculation fully embraced certain democratic tenets espoused and practiced by early Puritan settlers. Namely, as constitutions were formed—both on the state and national levels—throughout the eastern seaboard—founding statesmen chose to preserve key democratic principles already existent and in practice. One such privilege was citizens' rights to political self-determination through active participation in governance by means of suffrage.

This brief overview substantiates the fact that ecclesiastical engagement in shaping governmental structures and policies has been a standard practice since European church bodies first arrived in America. However, during the revolutionary stage of American history, an interesting development occurs that establishes a distinct line between church and state at the federal level, thus consigning ecclesiastical groups to a decisive legal framework relative to their influence on government. The subsequent section considers the emergence of this historical development and how it instituted the legal basis of the lobbying work CLOs do today.

Ecclesiastical Bodies and the Founding of the United States Government

During the Revolutionary period there was a distinct American pluralism existent in religious life. Consequently, a basic result of this socio-religious reality manifested in varied Christian groups' distinct relationship to the colonial governments in their respective geographical areas. As such, religious and political interests were ostensibly at variance as historical examples abound showing the range of ecclesiastical

political involvement.¹⁷⁹ However, reflecting specifically upon the role Puritans played in shaping governmental processes in New England, this type of political participation is perhaps the least to be expected of religious bodies in that period. What is quite fascinating is that at this stage there appears to be a veritable shift away from the Puritan model of governmental engagement explored in the previous section.

One may legitimately conclude that at decisive moments when the founders gathered to erect a viable national government, the most influential ecclesiastical leaders would have been present adding their voices to the various deliberations that determined the political trajectory of the nation. However, on the national level, it is intriguing that direct clergy involvement was largely absent at most of the assemblies held to discuss these issues.

Firstly, at the Continental Congress that was held in Philadelphia, commencing on September 5, 1774, and concluding on October 26, 1774, distinguished delegates representing twelve out of the Thirteen Colonies (Georgia excluded) were sent to attend this pivotal meeting.¹⁸⁰ One historian identifies the purpose and challenges confronted at the First Continental Congress as follows: “The colonies presented there were united in a determination to show a combined authority to Great Britain, but their aims were not uniform at all. Pennsylvania and New York sent delegates with firm instructions to seek a resolution with England. The other colonies’ voices were defensive of colonial rights, but pretty evenly divided between those who sought legislative parity, and the more radical members who were prepared for separation.” In short, the delegates from the twelve colonies represented there gathered and debated as they sought to find a suitable solution that would adequately address their grievances with Britain.

Even though “the Continental Congress issued a number of acts touching religion—ranging from designating national days of fasting, prayer and thanksgiving to the appointment of legislative chaplains and more,”¹⁸¹ one would assume at a gathering of such great magnitude, in the sense that it had the potential to drastically affect the political configuration and future of the American colonies, the clergy would have been significantly represented as delegates. Upon closer review of the professions of the delegates that were in attendance, however, there was not a single clergyperson participating. Instead, the delegates were mostly wealthy, and certainly prominent, businessmen, farmers, judges, justices of the peace, lawyers, merchants, mercantilists, millers, planters, politicians, sheriffs, soldiers, solicitors, and surveyors.¹⁸² Surprisingly, there was even one astronomer present, Stephen Hopkins of Rhode Island,

whose biography celebrates the fact that he “observed the transit of Venus on June 3, 1769.”¹⁸³ More astonishing, however, is that there was not one ordained clergyperson at the Congress from all the diverse and numerous Christian denominations that settled in America. Albeit, there were in attendance professing men of faith, like Charles Humphreys—a Quaker from Pennsylvania—who at the Second Continental Congress voted against the Declaration of Independence because he strongly believed that a vote in favor of independence would inevitably make him culpable of instigating war; and if war resulted, which it did, rendering his support was a clear violation of his Quaker faith.¹⁸⁴ Nevertheless, it is worth restating that no professional clergypersons were present at the First Continental Congress.¹⁸⁵

In May of 1775, the Second Continental Congress commenced. This emergency assembly was held to specifically address “the military threat of the British.”¹⁸⁶ The delegates on this occasion—now representing all Thirteen Colonies—gathered specifically to devise a strategy that would effectively respond to the military conflict that was raging in Massachusetts between the Redcoats and the colonialists.¹⁸⁷ Many of the listed names of the delegates present were the same as the First Continental Congress, although not all. Nevertheless, a similar pattern is recognizable—mostly men of vast wealth and prominence.

There were some variances, however, specifically in terms of the inclusion of men from fields of study that were not initially represented at the first assembly. Among those present at this Second Continental Congress were a printer, publisher, inventor, and scientist, all in the person of Benjamin Franklin.¹⁸⁸ Additionally, there were educators, physicians, and, in fact, one clergyperson present—John Witherspoon, a Presbyterian minister and the President of the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University. At this Second Continental Congress, Witherspoon was the only professional clergy to participate in the negotiations and pen his name as one of the 56 signatories of the Declaration of Independence.

Furthermore, on November 15, 1777, the Continental Congress achieved a momentous step that would permanently alter the American political landscape by producing the first legal document that outlined an initial structure of the United States federal government. “The Continental Congress adopted” as one historian affirms, “the Articles of Confederation, the first constitution of the United States.”¹⁸⁹ As was the case with the drafting and signing of the Declaration of Independence, John Witherspoon

was once again the only clergy present to participate and add his name to the Articles of Confederation.

Moreover, a careful analysis of the ratified Articles of Confederation reveals the one and only mention of religion is in the context of presenting an existential threat to the instituted government. The third article reads, “The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever.”¹⁹⁰ This statement provides insight into the majority of Congressional delegates’ views toward religion broadly. Accordingly, it is reasonable to deduce that the founders’ initial perception of religion in the context of the burgeoning political order was not that of an ally or benign entity, but rather a potential enemy to the union of states that had to be safeguarded against. Hence, there is little astonishment to discover that when the Constitutional Convention convened on May 25, 1787—with the sole aim to fortify the federal government by producing a stronger and more comprehensive constitutional document—there was not one single clergyperson in attendance. The closest personality to match such a description was Abraham Baldwin who studied theology at Yale College, and subsequently joined the military as a chaplain during the American Revolutionary War. Once his military service was complete, he opted not go into the ministry but attend law school instead.¹⁹¹ He is celebrated for being both a delegate at the Constitutional Convention and founder of Franklin College which is today the University of Georgia in Athens.¹⁹²

Throughout the duration of the Continental Congresses and the Constitutional Convention, the only clergy represented in the debating chambers of Philadelphia were John Witherspoon, and disputably Abraham Baldwin, whose background may qualify him as clergy to some. Both of whom were by profession college presidents, with the first holding the title Presbyterian minister, and the second, military chaplain. However, during this decisive moment in American history, the leadership of the ecclesiastical bodies throughout the emerging states—with their voices, views, opinions, insights, experiences, wisdom, and knowledge—were essentially absent from the rooms where the most significant discussions were held that would ultimately give birth to the United States of America. This factor is indispensable to understanding the enduring

relationship between the church and the state, and the historical development of church lobby groups.

Fundamentally, this pattern of engagement with government for the church was a shift from how the Congregationalists of New England conducted themselves in the past. Once chief architects and engineers of governmental designs in New England, Congregationalists, and like groups, now found themselves assuming a radically different role from that of their past political exercises. The foregoing discloses that as the structure of the federal government was being framed, the leaders of ecclesiastical bodies were relegated to the sidelines. Speculation abounds as to why they were missing at the decision-making table.¹⁹³ Could it have been a lack of political clout on the state level? For as one historian informs, Congressional delegates “were appointed and paid by their respective state governments.”¹⁹⁴ Did denominational bodies not have efficient enough political power on the state level to demand that delegates from their respective religious communities were represent at the Continental Congresses or Constitutional Convention? Or perhaps, certain ecclesiastical bodies were reluctant to participate in the conspiracy against Britain, preferring to politically align themselves with the loyalists who fought alongside the British? Thus, their flawed political calculation ultimately left them excluded by the revolutionary leaders. Or perchance, certain religious bodies posed too great a political threat to the framers’ pursuit of power or the unification of the nation that the framers tactically outmaneuvered them; thus making access to the Congresses and Constitutional Convention essentially insurmountable? More questions can be raised that probe into the underlying reasons for clergy’s conspicuous absence at these assemblies. Although definitive answers may prove rather elusive to these questions, there is, however, some historical evidence that sheds light on the founders’ views on religion that suggests more probable answers.

Aside from the brief mention of religion explored above in the Articles of Confederation, prior to the adoption of the First Amendment, the topic of religion appears nebulous in much of the historical documentation surrounding the activities and deliberations at the Continental Congresses and the Constitutional Convention. However, the historical evidence that renders a key insight into the founders’ general opinion about religion is found in the public documents they drafted. Categorically the Constitution itself, as Wilson rightly suggests, assists in understanding the underlying motivation for the founders taking the path of ecclesiastical exclusion,

“What role did the Constitution delineate for religion? The remarkable conclusion is that, for all of the controversy with regard to religion that had attended constitution-making in the colonies as they became states, the Philadelphia Convention seems largely to have passed over this subject in silence. One very specific provision is embedded in Article VI. Its third paragraph specifies that all officers of the new federal government, as well as those in the several states, “shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this constitution.” Coupled with this requirement, the article declares that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.” Such a blanket prohibition dramatically contrasts with the struggles that took place in many of the states, especially to retain religiously based restrictions on office-holding.”¹⁹⁵

The foregoing analysis notes several key insights that aid in understanding the founders’ thinking on religion at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. Outside of the historical tensions manifest in the various states regarding this issue, the essential points to note here specifically relate to language embedded in the Constitution itself which contends: 1) the support of the Constitution was preeminent, and 2) religion was not a prerequisite to serve in public office. Effectively, these two simple measures jointly reinforced the sovereignty of the republic, while also ensuring its subjection to no other force or entity, especially ecclesiastical bodies.

This minimalist language pertaining to religion has had a tremendous consequence upon the body politic of the United States; in this case, clearly, the lack of verbosity is certainly not indicative of the force of effect resulting from these two short phrases. One rationale behind this silence, as Witte and Nicholas argue, “It was commonly assumed at the convention that questions of religion and religious liberty were for the states and the people to resolve, not the budding federal government.”¹⁹⁶ They further add, “By 1784 eleven of thirteen states had already crafted detailed constitutional provisions on religious liberty. The two remaining states, Rhode Island and Connecticut, had retained their colonial charters, which included religious liberty clauses.”¹⁹⁷ An additional position for this particular method employed by the founders to marginally address religion further assists in understanding the potential negative impact and outcomes of broaching the subject matter. As one historian suggests, “It may help moderns to comprehend why the framers passed over religion as a contentious topic if they recognize that it held the potential to engender divisions that would decisively frustrate their larger objective.”¹⁹⁸ Hence, the initial silence or minimalist approach to the topic of religion does not necessarily denote the founders were unaware or unconcerned, for the historical evidence proves otherwise. Rather, they were

strategic in the manner in which they sought to address it. Silence and exclusion of certain groups was perhaps an intentional method to transcend a divisive subject already being addressed on the state level and that may jeopardize the union before its inception. Therefore, the staying of the issue was certainly not the end, but a means to achieving a higher objective. Inevitably, it had to be addressed but the proper timing was most imperative.

Eventually the right time came. On September 17, 1787, the framers of the Constitution of the United States signed it and sent it to the states for approval; while simultaneously, the idea of developing a Bill of Rights was circulating amongst delegates. Wilson confirms: “As the states reviewed the Constitution to ratify it (or withhold support) the question of provision for religion’s formal relationship to the new government was discussed and criticized, eliciting numerous suggestions.”¹⁹⁹ The lack of a “religious liberty guarantee” in the Constitution impeded its immediate ratification.²⁰⁰ Although the precise content and language of a religious liberty guarantee were not settled, certain states required of its eventual drafting as a conditionality for the Constitution’s ratification.²⁰¹ They realized such an act was a necessity to protect religion against the state and protect the state against religion. A forthcoming guarantee in this form would seek to sufficiently address religion’s place in the new political order, especially since the union was established and strengthening.

Naturally, the pluralistic religious tenor of the union contributed to fierce debates as to what direction to move. Massachusetts, Virginia, Maryland, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, and Rhode Island, as individual states, drafted and submitted their proposed religious liberty amendments. Leading statesmen such as Madison, Sylvester, Gerry, Sherman, and Carroll strongly voiced their opinions. Most were clearly in favor of maintaining and further delineating a distinct barrier between religion and its influence upon government. The abiding angst articulated in the Articles of the Confederacy certainly had not subsided. The idea persisted that a politically powerful religious sect may metamorphose into an uncontrollable faction that would arrest the powers of government. Thus, every effort essential to preempting the likelihood of any faction—religious or secular—accruing exorbitant political power that would undermine the liberal democratic experiment underway had to be exercised. Thus, founders called for certain measures to be established within the Constitution if it were to be amended.

In November of 1787, Madison, a leading voice on this subject matter amongst the founders, outlined in ‘Federalist Paper No. 10’ certain measures he anticipated would solve the stated dilemma. Madison’s eagle-eyed perception into human behavior discerned a political compromise that sought to transcend a human condition that inherently worked against the political order the founders were seeking to establish. Directly addressing the underlying source of factions Madison explains,

“The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere brought into different degrees of activity, according to the different circumstances of civil society. A zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well of speculation as of practice; an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for pre-eminence and power; or to persons of other descriptions whose fortunes have been interesting to the human passions, have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to co-operate for their common good.”²⁰²

In his statement we gain insight into the human condition of which Madison was challenged to harness in such a way as to produce a positive political outcome. It is particularly astute that in his analysis of factions in general, he asserts that all their efforts are designed to secure and achieve certain interests; be it a lion’s share of the allocation of national resources; or the imposition of, in the case of religious groups, their particular theological or ideological worldview upon the national body. Their natural propensity for Madison was clear in that such groups aimed to promote and codify, legislatively, sectarian advantages or beliefs, at times clearly in opposition to the common good.

Hence, he proposes a solution to the quandary the nation faced. He submits, “A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source.”²⁰³ As is the case with secular factions, for Madison the primary means to neutralize religious factions’ power was to solicit and allow the active participation of all religious groups in the life of the body politic to petition government. Thus, for Madison, this potential threat to the common good; this inherent weakness to the burgeoning republic; and this potentially destabilizing force that characteristically bends toward oppression was instead transformed into a unique strength that would ensure the nation’s longevity and promote its well-being. In other words, the emerging nation would now remain unified by promoting a division of

interests that, if otherwise left unchecked, would foster its demise. Thus, Madison spiritedly argued to unleash the power of all factions to engage government through the means of lobbying. For to permit these sectarian forces to freely act to pursue their interests in this way served as the great equalizer that evaded a detrimental impact to the general welfare of American society by a singular, yet powerful, group influence. Fundamentally for Madison, this one act served as a vital safeguard to the emerging national character.

Madison's ideas prevailed. On December 15, 1791, the Constitution was amended, and the Bill of Rights adopted. Accordingly, the very first of the amendments addressed the issue of religion directly. As it states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."²⁰⁴ Additionally, it is no happenstance that within this First Amendment the phrases concerning religious liberty and the petitioning of government are coexistent. As shown above, Madison apprehended that the sanction of the free practice of religion, while simultaneously prohibiting governmental endorsement of any one in particular, would result in fostering a competitive environment between religious groups with certain political aspirations. This alongside the right to petition government motivates religious groups divided by the pursuit of their individual interests to seek government as arbitrator. Therefore, government's authority is buttressed in multitudinous ways. Moreover, the resolution to the political quandary Madison and the founders faced was codified into the basic law of the United States as a guiding principle for the nation.

Interesting, however, as Madison and the other founders apparently succeeded in safeguarding the United States of America against powerful religious or secular factions in the nation, this group of men of prominence and wealth constituted the most powerful faction in the United States during that era. As stated above, wealthy merchants and planters and the best and brightest legal minds and politicians comprised their ranks. Moreover, historical records corroborate that not only were they the very architects of the constitutional framework of the United States of America, they became its engineers and custodians.²⁰⁵ Sequentially, after establishing the United States' government, these very powerful men of affluence seized its reins and took firm hold. While other individuals or groups, outside of this body of men, were now forced to appeal to them for under their authority and control was the mechanism by which

political sovereignty was dispensed. There was certainly no symmetry of power between the founders as a faction and other factions—religious or secular—that may have existed in the United States at that time. The founders had a clear advantage, despite the general characterizations by certain historians that romanticize them as objectively noble statesmen principally driven by the common good for all citizens. For the measures taken to safeguard the government were ultimately measures advanced to secure themselves and their interests, as they filled the ranks of the very body of government they were seeking to protect.

Furthermore, it is fascinating that at this juncture in history, the formation of a federalist system of governance substantially shifted the weight of political power from local and state levels to the national body.²⁰⁶ The primary concerns voiced at that period in American history were the need for collective security and economic collaboration. Naturally, such issues compelled the emerging states in this direction. The herculean effort to unify the former colonies into a collective whole certainly presented its challenges, specifically considering the obstacles that accompanied building a nation whose population growth was based primarily on mass migration of distinct European cultures to American shores—with their varied thoughts and opinions, particularly on the role of politics and religion in society—as well as the forced migration of slave labor from Africa. A fragmented people over a vast territory were thus being forged into a unique union. This pluralistic tenor within American society, coupled with the forming of a national union, inherently limited the scope of influence certain church bodies may have possessed on a state or federal level. This being the case, the Puritan political model of the past that allowed for group control of political affairs within a limited sphere of influence was additionally weakened and further consigned on both state and national levels to a decisive external participatory function in government.

The Revolutionary period in American history is precisely the historical interval when religious bodies were consigned to the primary status of petitioners or, in modern vernacular, lobbyists of government. With the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, the rights and privileges established within the First Amendment were secured for all citizens, including former slaves.

As shown, the following factors contributed to the codification of lobbying as a legal right for religious bodies: the measured handling of religion as a theme at the Continental Congresses and the Constitutional Convention, and ultimately, the adoption of the Bill of Rights with its language on religious liberty. Hence, the United

States government became the focus of various religious bodies' lobbying efforts. Anglicans, Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others denominational entities—some of whose political power had been weakened as the founders erected and controlled government—were now relegated to the role of lobby agents.

Ecclesiastical Lobbying and Religious Liberty Post-Declaration of Independence

Throughout the Revolutionary period, ecclesiastical bodies were already finding themselves engaged as petitioners or lobbyists of government, even prior to the ratification of the Bill of Rights. Accordingly, in all of the thirteen states, whether they were in the majority or minority of citizen groups, these entities were found competing against one another, as each respective group sought to secure their own interests. Furthermore, it is perfunctory to conclude that the various Christian groups were united in lockstep at any time against non-Christian factions to secure interests for a unified church in that era. To the contrary, early American history repeatedly depicts a different picture. Frequently, Christians from one denomination found themselves in opposition to Christians of another, as each vied for political hegemony. Thus, a plethora of varied interests and petitions flowed toward the established legislative bodies.

A major concern was precisely how ecclesiastical bodies and government would relate to one another at the state level. Important questions regarding clergy involvement in government, denominational affiliation as a prerequisite to political office, and the legality of individual non-Christians to run for government all required answering.²⁰⁷ As briefly stated above, each state's constitution or charters sought to address these issues. Governmental actors began to serve as mediators between the various Christian groups that sought political primacy in their respective states. The lack of political unity across the denominational spectrum, and the contentious struggles that ensued between them, had this peculiar effect. Thus, religious bodies were forced in the direction of government to appeal to leadership as they sought to convince both state and national politicians to uphold their interests. This behavioral characteristic was particularly evident in their attempts to shape their respective state constitutions. Wilson describes the pressures politicians faced as they sought to address these concerns and delineate the role religion would occupy in each state:

“Each of the states adopted provisions for religion that varied as widely as their separate paths to independent constitutions. Their courses of action reflect the complex status of religion in the revolutionary period. The most noteworthy developments with respect to religion took place in Virginia and Massachusetts . . . South Carolina’s 1778 constitution effectively “established” Christianity, restricting legal incorporation to those bodies that subscribed to broadly Protestant beliefs. Although support for religion was not mandated, office-holding was restricted to “Protestants.” With its second constitution (1790), only clergy were barred from holding office and the “free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship” (p. 24) was extended to all. When it had been a colony North Carolina favored the Church of England—however marginal its actual presence. With its 1776 constitution, nonetheless, no church was preferred, nor was any religious requirement placed on citizens—but office-holding was at least nominally limited to Protestant Christians. Georgia’s constitution of 1777 took a generally similar course—although it did permit assessment of citizens for the support of their own ministers. Successive Georgia constitutions (1789, 1798) eliminated the religious restrictions on office-holding and authorized assessments for support of religion.”²⁰⁸

Each jurisdiction wrestled with establishing a proper demarcation between religion and the state. In the case of South Carolina, with the ratification of its second constitution, a definitive line was drawn prohibiting clergy’s designation to public office. This was certainly an atypical case because other states did not outright bar clergy from occupying public office. Specifically reflecting on the decisions made by North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, individuals at the helm of shaping their respective state apparatuses allowed for freedom of religious practice. However, there was an overt move to limit church influence upon government by barring, as was the case in South Carolina, and not mandating in the other two states that elected officials hold any particular Christian confession.

Each state’s approach to defining the function of religion within its individual boundaries varied to the degree to which the strength of the ecclesiastical bodies’ political organization was established. For instance, “Among the New England colonies Massachusetts most directly addressed issues entailed in the relations between religion and government. Congregationalists effectively comprised a privileged religious body that benefited from various forms of public support such as mandated tax support for ministers—although exemptions were permitted.”²⁰⁹ This is certainly no astonishment, considering the political acumen and engagement of Puritans in the past. The robust political organization of the Puritans clearly propelled them in achieving policies most favorable to their interests in the states where they resided.

Paradoxically, however, the strength of the Congregationalists' political organization made them simultaneously a political power and a political threat to be targeted by other religious groups. For example, minority ecclesiastical bodies—like the Baptists of New England—were clearly threatened by the Congregationalists' display of political clout; therefore, they labored to counter and neutralize them. This political struggle between these two Christian groups of New England resulted in what many may agree was a most favorable outcome for the body politic of the United States as a whole. To explain, this conflict prompted both state and national interventions that further buttressed the principle of religious liberty in America. Reviewing the history of this political struggle, Wilson apprises that in the state of Massachusetts, “Especially Baptists formed a phalanx of dissenters intent on embarrassing—and eventually seeking to overturn—this ecclesiastical system. After failing to gain approval from the towns in 1778 for a constitution (that did not include specified rights or guarantee free exercise of religion), a special convention produced a new constitution in 1780. Two articles provided for religion.”²¹⁰ Moreover, this struggle on the part of the Baptist of New England to ensure religious liberty against the predominant political power of Congregationalists in that part of the United States was not limited to Massachusetts. Wilson further discloses,

“Connecticut—which shared general presumptions about religious matters with Massachusetts—converted its royal charter into a continuing instrument of government. Because no new constitution was drafted, none was subject to ratification. Here early opposition took the form of “Separates” who distanced themselves from the settled Congregational churches. Continuing resistance led to growing Baptist presence and influence. This system formally remained in place until 1818.”²¹¹

In the various states mentioned, this persistent political divide between Congregationalists and Baptists led to a national discussion that included Thomas Jefferson, the president of the United States.

On October 7, 1801, the clergy of the Danbury Baptist Association of Connecticut gathered to draft a letter petitioning Thomas Jefferson to serve as a champion for religious liberty. In fact, their correspondence is one of the earliest well-known ecclesiastical direct lobbying communiqués in United States history. This is precisely because it reflected their group interests with the direct intent of influencing the federal policy at that time. In a letter addressed to the newly inaugurated president, the Danbury Baptists pen the following words,

“Our sentiments are uniformly on the side of religious liberty—that religion is at all times and places a matter between God and individuals—that no man ought to suffer in name, person, or effects on account of his religious opinions—that the legitimate power of civil government extends no further than to punish the man who works ill to his neighbors; But, sir, our constitution of government is not specific. Our ancient charter together with the law made coincident therewith, were adopted as the basis of our government, at the time of our revolution; and such had been our laws and usages, and such still are; that religion is considered as the first object of legislation; and therefore what religious privileges we enjoy (as a minor part of the state) we enjoy as favors granted, and not as inalienable rights; and these favors we receive at the expense of such degrading acknowledgements as are inconsistent with the rights of freemen. It is not to be wondered at therefore; if those who seek after power and gain under the pretense of government and religion should reproach their fellow men—should reproach their order magistrate, as an enemy of religion, law, and good order, because he will not, dare not, assume the prerogatives of Jehovah and make laws to govern the kingdom of Christ.”²¹²

This letter concludes with the Danbury Baptists’ acknowledgement of the limits of presidential authority in effecting laws within individual states, as well as the limits of his powers in respect to certain legal checks and balances on the federal level that preclude him from making laws by fiat that would automatically ensure freedom of religion.²¹³ Notwithstanding these factors, they articulate their desired hope that Jefferson’s opinions and backing of freedom of religion “will shine and prevail through all these states and all the world, till hierarchy and tyranny be destroyed from the earth.”²¹⁴ Unmistakably, the Danbury Baptists realized as the chief executive of the nation, there were certain legal restrictions on Jefferson’s ability to secure the protections they sought on the state and national levels. Despite these realities, the sagaciousness of their petition rested in their well-calculated attempt to move Jefferson to act in their interest as their chief advocate and lobbyist for religious liberty nationally.

History affirms that their calculation was effective. In response to the Danbury Baptists’ letter, Jefferson on January 1, 1802, penned his well-known retort on religious liberty. Unquestionably, the prescriptions in his letter have endured the test of time and have provided a precedent to be consulted when considering matters of the church and state in the context of the United States of America. The very concept of *separation of church and state* originated in this letter of Jefferson’s and has influenced the relationship between the church and state in the years to follow.

Jefferson’s letter opens with the affirmation that a primary objective and concern for him, as the holder of the highest public office in the United States, is as he understands, “a faithful and zealous pursuit of the interests of my constituents”.²¹⁵ As

has been already stated, the fundamental purpose of lobbying is to urge elected officials to pursue the interests of their constituency with the hope that they will in fact do so. Although, at this juncture in history the term is still wanting, in this exchange between Jefferson and the Danbury Baptists the activity is undoubtedly in full effect.

Furthermore, what is fascinating is that Jefferson immediately acknowledges a direct connection between the interest of his constituency and the exercise of the powers of the presidential office in accordance with such interests, expressly in cases when there is no infringement upon the common good. While the term *common good* is not directly mentioned; it is certainly inferred. The statesmanship of Jefferson thus allows for his support of the Baptist's petition, as there is no violation of the common good; in effect, their appeal preserves and strengthens it. The following words of Jefferson give us insight into his concern—to reiterate, not only to secure the interests of his constituents but also to seek and defend the common good:

“Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, & not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should ‘make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,’ thus building a wall of separation between Church & State. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.”²¹⁶

This rejoinder reflects the aspirations of the Danbury Baptists and affirms their objectives were in consonance with his vision for American political life broadly. Moreover, it is apparent that their lobbying efforts brought attention to their most pertinent interests at the highest levels of government, garnered mutual support for its protection, and inspired an advocate whose scope of influence was certainly far-reaching in the political sphere. Consequently, this political conflict between ecclesiastical bodies of New England motivated a minority religious group to entreat President Jefferson's aid, as they clearly acknowledged the necessity of governmental intervention to settle the matter of dispute.

It is important to note that there are ecclesiastical groups, as well as other segments within American society, that have concluded that Jefferson's call to uphold “a wall of separation” between church and state to mean religious groups complete abstention from political activities. However, this concept of a “wall of separation”

conceived by Jefferson clearly asserts that no one church shall have the endorsement of government above all other religious bodies, or, for that matter, maintain a monopolistic control over government. After all, as clearly demonstrated the Danbury Baptists, correspondence was in itself an act of lobbying aimed at influencing public policy, which served to further solidify and protect religious liberty. In other words, the very conception of the separation of church and state as a jurisprudential and philosophical theory was initiated by a church body's political action, which inherently implies Jefferson never envisioned it to mean religious bodies' complete recusal from American political life.

In review, during this period in the early history of the United States, ecclesiastical bodies are identified as active petitioners of government both on the state and national levels. Lobbying activities, as we have come to know them today, are clearly expressed in these historical precedents. During this timeframe and beyond, we discover groups employing similar methods to address socio-political concerns at variance with their Christian convictions. This is particularly evident during ensuing abolition movements which we shall consider in the next section.

Ecclesiastical Lobbying and the Institution of Slavery

The foregoing historical examples illustrate lobbying actions taken by ecclesiastical bodies when their self-interests were clearly in mind. Although the acknowledgement can be made that, in the example of the Baptists of New England, the common good for American society was tied to their political interests. Irrefutably, self-interest was a motivating factor here; yet there are numerous historical illustrations where church groups lobbied government on behalf of other groups from a seemingly more altruistic perspective. In such cases, citizens from various Christian backgrounds used their voices to advocate for just policies that would challenge systems of oppression and exploitation. Their faith compelled them through this political means to act against forces that systemically deprived men, women, and children of equality, liberty, and a fuller inclusion into American society. The institution of slavery is a clear example of an unjust, legally established convention that moved men and women of faith and conscience to forcefully speak out against it and lobby for its abolishment.

Although, like Thomas Jefferson, founders of the United States of America voiced that slavery was a violation of natural rights endowed by God, they elected to

allow its perpetuation as the union of states coalesced. In fact, though later omitted from the final version, the following statement was initially included in Thomas Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration of Independence:

“[King George III] has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life & liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought & sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce...”²¹⁷

Jefferson's foregoing words harshly chide King George III for his hypocritical and immoral conduct against African slaves. His offense is so abominable in Jefferson's opinion that he questions the sincerity of the king's professed Christian faith. Apparently, it baffled Jefferson as to how King George III could reconcile such a stark contradiction within himself. Consequently, Jefferson views each proceeding act that brought King George III exorbitant wealth—as the direct result of the exploitation, oppression, and enslavement of people of African descent—resulted in the very singeing of the monarch's conscience. Nonetheless, as Jefferson reflects upon this grave injustice being perpetrated against Africans, he decisively concludes that the king's refusal to end slavery was in fact one of the principal factors in his estimation that legitimated the legality and necessity of declaring independence from Britain. Despite Jefferson's initial assessment, the historical events that follow demonstrate economic expediency outweighed moral rectitude in his and the other founders' final judgment as the above language on the evils of slavery was excluded from the final version of the Declaration of Independence.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy to consider that at the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, the tender sensibilities Jefferson professes in support of alleviating the suffering of African slaves disappears, and the opposing opinion he argued vigorously against is fully embraced by Jefferson, who in the end grows wealthy from the very same institution he initially condemns. As Wiencek affirms, “In his lifetime, Jefferson owned more than 600 slaves.”²¹⁸ This cadre of slaves served as the labor force that amassed great wealth for Jefferson and provided him with the lavish lifestyle and creature comforts that he surrounded himself with at his Monticello mansion. Describing Jefferson's palatial residence, Wiencek further details,

“Jefferson appeared every day at first light on Monticello’s long terrace, walking alone with his thoughts. From his terrace Jefferson looked out upon an industrious, well-organized enterprise of black coopers, smiths, nailmakers, a brewer, cooks professionally trained in French cuisine, a glazier, painters, millers and weavers. Black managers, slaves themselves, oversaw other slaves. A team of highly skilled artisans constructed Jefferson’s coach. The household staff ran what was essentially a mid-sized hotel, where some 16 slaves waited upon the needs of a daily horde of guests.”²¹⁹

The very same man who initially and categorically denounced a king for the grave injustices he inflicted upon people of African descent—which, again, in his initial estimation served in part as a justification for revolution—changes his mind as the allurements of perpetuating this immoral institution proved more attractive than the alternative of instituting justice for the enslaved. Although certain historians commend Jefferson at least for his liberal attempts to insert abolitionist language into the Declaration of Independence; others, on the other hand, question the legitimacy of such commendations. “Virginia abolitionist Moncure Conway” namely, “noting Jefferson’s enduring reputation as a would-be emancipator, remarked scornfully, ‘Never did a man achieve more fame for what he did not do.’”²²⁰ In a similar vein, Wiencek concludes, “we can see the process by which he rationalized an abomination to the point where an absolute moral reversal was reached and he made slavery fit into America’s national enterprise.”²²¹

Despite Jefferson’s ultimate position on slavery—its propagation by the founders²²² and certain arrivistes within American society—historical records show that from early colonial history directly up until January 1, 1863, when President Lincoln emancipated the slaves in the United States of America, “Church leaders took their place in the abolitionist forces.”²²³ Ebersole concurs, “The first printed protest against slavery in America was made by one George Keith, a Quaker, in 1693. It appeared under the heading ‘An Exhortation and Caution to Friends Concerning Buying or Keeping of Negroes.’”²²⁴ George Keith’s communiqué was specifically directed at his fellow Quakers, encouraging them to express “true *Christian Love*”²²⁵ by only purchasing slaves if their sole objective was manumission; otherwise, they were implored to abstain from procuring or selling slaves.²²⁶ George Keith further pleads that in situations where a Quaker was in possession of slaves he had paid for, that Quaker would educate them and release them as swiftly as possible, or right after they recouped money for their purchase.²²⁷ This initial call to action that George Keith directed toward

the men and women of the Quaker faith was essentially an economic appeal to boycott this unconscionable enterprise that generated its wealth by the subjugation of their fellow humans. This abolitionist call which focused on condemning slavery as an institution and calling for nonparticipation in the slave industry through moral suasion was also embodied in fellow Quakers the likes of Cadwalader Morgen, William Southeby, Alice Curwen, Elihu Coleman, and John Hepburn. Their public statements and actions unquestionably place Quakers alongside the leading proponents amongst church groups in that era calling for the end to slavery. However, it would be inaccurate to advance that this form of moral suasion should be defined as lobbying in its contemporary sense.

“Some abolitionists,” Sinha confirms, “...sought to harness the power of the state against slavery.”²²⁸ In particular, Methodists and certain Baptist groups’ spiritual and humanitarian convictions compelled them to not only speak out against slavery as a moral evil but called for political action. “In 1789,” Ebersole discloses, “the General Committee of Virginia Baptists passed a resolution declaring that ‘slavery is a violent deprivation of the rights of nature and inconsistent with a republican government and therefore recommend it to our brethren to make use of every legal means to extirpate this horrid evil from the land.’” Reflecting on this precise case, the Virginia Baptists’ response to slavery can be interpreted as a plea to engage politically by utilizing all viably lawful means to end it. In this instance, the term ‘legal means,’ however, is ambiguously defined and is consequently open to interpretation as to whether lobbying would be included in this declaration. Yet, in the case of the Methodists, their national body articulated a precise procedural approach to be implemented in the effort to achieve a desired political outcome in relation to ending slavery. Methodist history reveals, “The Methodist Conference of 1800 directed the Annual Conference to ‘draw up addresses for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, to the legislatures of those States in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose... LET THIS BE CONTINUED FROM YEAR TO YEAR TILL THE DESIRED END BE ACCOMPLISHED.’”²²⁹

The significance of the Methodist proposal as outlined is that it conveyed an unyielding resolve to eradicate slavery through a well-defined, pragmatic political approach.²³⁰ However, in both illustrations, the respective ecclesiastical bodies clearly acknowledge the necessity for calculated legal or political engagement; notwithstanding that in the case of the Methodists their formulated strategy was in fact a direct lobbying strategy in which particular state legislatures were the principal

targets. In the context of early U.S. history, this approach by the Methodists is a revealing example of lobbying taking center stage as an optimal way for Christians to express their faith in the public square by aiding a subjugated people in their quest for liberation.

While the specified Baptists, Quakers, Methodists, and other likeminded Christian groups formulated their distinct plans to guide their abolitionist activities; there were indubitably occasions when clergy of varied denominational backgrounds united to engage in collective action that was directed at compelling Congress to act against slavery. “In 1854, during the Kansas-Nebraska controversy, three thousand and fifty clergymen of New England forwarded a protest to the United States Senate against the passage of the Nebraska Bill.”²³¹ This controversial bill was introduced by Senator Stephen Douglas of Illinois and basically gave the new states that resulted from territorial expansion—Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and North and South Dakota—the option to choose as singular actors whether or not to institute slavery within their boundaries.²³² As one historian details, “On January 4, 1854, Douglas introduced a bill designed to tread middle ground. He proposed organizing the vast territory ‘with or without slavery, as their constitutions may prescribe.’ Known as ‘popular sovereignty,’ this policy contradicted the Missouri Compromise and left open the question of slavery.”²³³

If enacted into law, this bill would effectively allow for the expansion of slavery within acceding states. With such a potential outcome, it captured the attention of abolitionists throughout the country. The abovementioned church leaders, in unison of voice and purpose, vehemently objected to its passage and penned the following words to Congress:

“To the Honorable, the Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, clergymen of different religious denominations in New England, hereby, in the name of almighty God, and in his presence, do solemnly protest against the passage of what is known as the Nebraska Bill, or any repeal or modification of the existing legal prohibitions of slavery in that part of our national domain which it is proposed to organize into the territories of Nebraska and Kansas. We protest against it as a great moral wrong, as a breach of faith eminently unjust to the moral principles of the community, and subversive of all confidence in national engagements; as a measure full of danger to the peace and even the existence of our beloved Union, and exposing us to the righteous judgments of the Almighty; and your protestants, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Boston, Massachusetts, March 1, 1854.”²³⁴

Of particular concern for this numerous and varied group of clergy signatories was the immoral underpinning on which this legislation was erected. This was indeed a primary basis for their dissent. For these men, slavery was not only a clear violation of the divine principles espoused and epitomized in the person of Jesus Christ; it created a deep chasm within the body politic of the United States that simply could not be reconciled. “In May of 1857, the Reverend Andrew Foss, of New Hampshire addressed the American Anti-slavery Society meeting in similar tones.”²³⁵ He contended, “Where slavery and freedom are put in one nation, there must be a fight—there must be an explosion, just as if fire and powder were brought together.”²³⁶

Even though certain scholars have characterized the attitudes or activities of some members of the American Anti-slavery Society as “apolitical” or “anti-governmental,” it is historically inaccurate to suggest that this organization’s mission rested solely on moral suasion or disengagement from politics, or was adverse to the lobbying of governmental authority. In fact, certain individuals may have clearly opposed the existent regime, law, or policy, while simultaneously working within the established mechanisms or polity of government to enact change. Such is the case of the American Anti-slavery society as an institutional body. In 1833 at the historic gathering in Philadelphia that led to its establishment, the American Anti-slavery Society’s constitution—drafted by William Lloyd Garrison and approved by over 60 abolitionists—affirmed lobbying, as understood in the contemporary, as a viable political method to eradicate slavery from the United States. Article II of that constitution states:

“The objects of this Society are the entire abolition of Slavery in the United States. While it admits that each State, in which Slavery exists, has, by the Constitution of the United States, the exclusive right to legislate in regard to its abolition in said State, it shall aim to convince all our fellow-citizens, by arguments addressed to their understandings and consciences, that Slaveholding is a heinous crime in the sight of God, and that the duty, safety, and best interests of all concerned, require its *immediate abandonment*, without expatriation. The Society will also endeavor, in a constitutional way, to influence Congress to put an end to the domestic Slave trade, and to abolish Slavery in all those portions of our common country which come under its control, especially in the District of Columbia,—and likewise to prevent the extension of it to any State that may be hereafter admitted to the Union.”²³⁷

Reverend Foss' above analogy proved to be prophetic in that the obstinate forces determined to perpetuate slavery were indeed unable to peaceably coexist with anti-slavery proponents who refused to rest until this unethical and moribund institution was abolished from American soil. In such a politically tense climate, church groups and their leaders held firm to their convictions and refused to remain silent, as they vigorously lobbied national decisionmakers with the hope that their counsel would be heeded and adopted into law.

On the other hand, certain politicians of that era looked contemptuously upon the lobbying activities of clergy engaged in the abolitionist movement.²³⁸ The following words of Senator Mason encapsulate such a politician's opinions:

If thirty thousand, or three hundred thousand citizens come from New England, let them be heard; but when they come here, not as citizens, but declaring that they come as ministers of the Gospel, and, as the honorable Senator from Texas declared them to be, vicegerents of the Almighty—so I understand him to declare, possibly he meant vice-regents to supervise and control legislation of the country—I say, when they come here as a class unknown to the Government, a class that the Government does not mean to know in any form or shape, not to recommend or remonstrate, but denounce our actions as a great moral wrong, because they claim to be the 'vicegerents' of the Almighty, we are bound... to carry out the policy of the Government and refuse to recognize them."²³⁹

Senators Mason's foregoing retort brings to mind images of a hard-hearted Pharaoh being confronted by the likes of a Moses. In his response, like in the book of Exodus, there is little, if any, deference to the religious office they held or any thoughtfulness to entertain the legitimacy of their concerns. Additionally, his haughty tone bespeaks not only a noticeable condescension; it reveals that the clergy's interposition into this public policy debate, in both content and manner, was perceived as an actual affront to the Senator and his public office. Consequently, he concludes that legislators should simply ignore them. The idea of 'refusing to recognize' a group of citizens solely based on their professions or the impetus they may claim for their action, as opposed to seeking to apprehend the validity of their proposal, is shortsighted. Such behavior and obstinacy to moral rectitude is ultimately what assisted in paving the way for the Civil War.

History reveals there were religious bodies that supported slavery and were adamantly opposed to abolition.²⁴⁰ In such cases, certain pro-slavery politicians conveniently did not hesitate to solicit the political aid of clergymen who they believed sympathized with their anti-abolitionist cause. "A letter [dated September 2, 1843] from Henry Clay to Reverend Walter Colton helps to make the point:

MY DEAR SIR:—Allow me to select a subject for one of your tracts, which treated in your popular and condensed way, I think would be of great and good effect. I mean abolition...

‘I will give you an outline of the manner in which I would handle it... Show that the agitation of the question, in the free States, will first destroy all harmony, and finally lead to disunion—perpetual war—the extermination of the African race—ultimate military despotism.

But the great aim and object of your tract should be to arouse the laboring classes in the free States against abolition. The slaves, being free, would be dispersed throughout the Union; they would enter into competition with the free laborer—with the American, the Irish, the German—reduce his wages, be confounded with him and affect his social standing...”²⁴¹

The foregoing argument wholly lacked substantiation as each point elevated sought to stoke fear, public outrage, and division in the hearts of key groups of men who comprised a substantial political base and voting bloc. Invidious of all is this last line of reasoning which was based on an economic position, inferring there would be a greater reduction in individual wages within a pool of solely free laborers, as opposed to one comprised of both free and slave labor. This was certainly diversionary. Perhaps most significant here is that certain pro-slavery politicians were not totally inflexible to clergy political participation; so long as it was in favor of utilizing their influence to build grass roots support against abolition.

It comes as little surprise that most anti-abolitionist churches were located in southern states where slavery was a particularly lucrative business. However, to rationalize to the point of acceptance the incongruous relationship between Christianity and chattel slavery, elaborate theological justifications were contrived. “Most white clerics of the antebellum South” as Earl affirms, “believed that they were bound by God to share the gospel of Jesus Christ with slaves... This minority group of divines was careful to interpret the scripture so as to accommodate slave masters’ economic interests.”²⁴² Earl further unfolds their purported defense and discloses, “Plantation preachers used the following rationale to support the claim that conversion to Christ would make model slaves: (1) The theological and ethical proof that God had ordained slavery as a moral means of preparing the African for the introduction of Christianity. God had suffered the white humanity to enslave Africans to bring their souls to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. (2) The soul salvation of the white Christian was invariably intertwined with the soul salvation of the slaves. White Christians believed God had made them stewards of the sacred scriptures for this express purpose.”²⁴³

Despite sharing denominational or theological ties with many anti-slavery congregations of the North, many Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, and Presbyterians of the South found their mutual support for the institution of slavery a stronger unifying bond amongst themselves than all the spiritual, doctrinal, or liturgical observations that connected them with the members of their respective northern communions. Reflecting on the relationship between various southern denominations and their active support of the slave trade, Frederick Douglass during a speech delivered in Sheffield, England on March 25, 1847, shared the following insights with his audience: “Revivals of the slave trade and revivals of the Bible societies went together. The auctioneer’s block stood in the same neighbourhood as the pulpit; and the blood-stained gold went to support the pulpit, while the pulpit, in return, covered the infernal slave business with the garb of Christianity... They had Methodists selling Methodists, Baptists selling Baptists, Presbyterians selling Presbyterians, and Episcopalians selling Episcopalians, to the highest bidder.”²⁴⁴

So as the winds of change were sweeping across the North and gaining strength through the organizing efforts of northern abolitionists and their churches, numerous southern religious bodies of various denominational stripes were determined to ensure the institution of slavery’s preservation, even if such a direction entailed the breaking of denominational ties with northern church affiliates. The congregations that united to establish the Southern Baptist Convention are a prime historical example of such a religious body that split over the issue of slavery.²⁴⁵

As Historical data corroborates, the primary reason why Baptist congregations predominately located in the southern states founded the Southern Baptist Convention was because of their refusal to denounce slavery, which was in direct conflict with their northern Baptists counterparts’ position on slavery. In detailing the origin of this split between Baptists one historian discloses, “The schism occurred, therefore, among Baptists in the mid-nineteenth century in their national mission societies. As Robert A. Baker said, ‘The pertinent question in each case was, will the Society appoint a slaveholder as missionary?’ By 1845, Baptists of the South believed, and with good reason, that the answer to that question was no. They, therefore, assembled at Augusta, Georgia, in May 1845 to form a new convention.”²⁴⁶ Not only did they form their own convention, “The members of southern churches were just as willing to urge political action as were their erstwhile brethren to the north. The Southern Baptist Convention, in 1861, adopted a series of resolutions in which the formation of Confederate States

was given approval.”²⁴⁷ Consequently, the Southern Baptist Convention as originally instituted joined the public debate on slavery as a political force focused on the preservation of slavery as an institution. Although elaborate arguments, including theological, were fabricated to justify slavery then, the Southern Baptist Convention drafted the “Resolution On Racial Reconciliation On The 150th Anniversary Of The Southern Baptist Convention” in 1995 stating that their forbearers’ actions at that particular historical juncture were completely incongruous with the teachings of Christ. The following is an excerpt from that resolution:

“WHEREAS, Our relationship to African-Americans has been hindered from the beginning by the role that slavery played in the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention; and
WHEREAS, Many of our Southern Baptist forbears defended the right to own slaves, and either participated in, supported, or acquiesced in the particularly inhumane nature of American slavery; and...
Therefore, be it RESOLVED, That we, the messengers to the Sesquicentennial meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, assembled in Atlanta, Georgia, June 20-22, 1995, unwaveringly denounce racism, in all its forms, as deplorable sin; and
Be it further RESOLVED, That we affirm the Bible’s teaching that every human life is sacred, and is of equal and immeasurable worth, made in Gods image, regardless of race or ethnicity (Genesis 1:27), and that, with respect to salvation through Christ, there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female, for (we) are all one in Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:28)”²⁴⁸

Indeed, if the acknowledgements evident in this resolution had come approximately 150 years earlier, it may have assisted the nation in abolishing slavery without the evils of war that ensued. However, that was not the case. Each group was unyielding in its corresponding position. On the one hand, Christian abolitionists were resolute in their lobbying efforts, purposely in the interest of the enslaved; while on the other, Christian slaveholders were unwavering as they employed the very same political tactic. There was, however, one major exception, in that the latter’s tenacity of political engagement was directed at preserving their personal, yet immoral, economic interests. Hence, this existent polarity only gave way to the condition of war.

In the context of early United States’ history, the political activities surrounding abolition give a clear depiction of various ecclesiastical bodies fully engaged in the phenomenon of lobbying. As the preceding historical examples have shown, lobbying activities on both state and federal levels were ideal methods of political engagement to promote public policies that were in alignment with ecclesiastical groups’ civic

objectives. In the case of certain Christian abolitionists, particularly, such aims sprang from an ethical framework congruent with the common good. Despite tremendous opposition from political leaders and adversarial religious bodies, these Christian groups stood boldly on this moral high ground and continued to raise their voices in creative political ways in the pursuit of accomplishing universal emancipation for enslaved people.

In the following section, we will investigate historical examples of lobbying activities initiated and sustained by African American ecclesiastical leadership during this period.

History of African American Lobbying During the Antebellum Period

The development of the intellectual capacity to master psychological, spiritual, social, economic, political, and material forces through scientific means, by a common people, over a vast territory, has produced the essential authority for certain groups to unleash an overpowering collective impulse against competing factions that was solely countered or balanced by a countervailing group force of similar or greater magnitude. Reinhold Niebuhr in his celebrated work, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, accordingly advances, “In every human group there is less reason to guide and check impulse, less capacity for self-transcendence, less ability to comprehend the needs of others and therefore more unrestrained egoism than the individuals, who compose the group.”²⁴⁹ He further asserts, “contemporary culture fails to realise the power, extent and persistence of group egoism in human relations.”²⁵⁰ Consequentially, Niebuhr insists that in order to counter the oppressive instincts of “group egoism” derived from more politically powerful social groups, “a measure of coercion”²⁵¹ is inevitable. A review of European history substantiates his claim. Without adequate coercive measures, numerous dominant European social aggregations have been inclined to subjugate and eradicate any outliers absent of the means, authority, or social organization to resist, as these forces secured their interests with inexorable tenacity. A prime historical example of this aspect of dominant social collectives’ physiognomy is illustrated in the emergence of the slave trade of the fifteenth century, as well as the institutionalization of slavery in the Americas. The consequential devastating negative impact upon people of African descent as chronicled in the histories of the world, and the forms of societal

inequality that remain to-date, are the indelible hallmarks of one overpowering social groups' egoism upon another.

Moreover, in the United States, the historical challenge faced by people of African descent to counter or balance such domination was to find a way to develop the intellectual capacity to survive the onslaught of aggression by the dominant social collective that sought their permanent subjugation. Additionally, after attaining freedom, the next challenge faced was to thrive in a nation where pervasive and perpetual hostilities threatened their very existence as a manumitted people. Therefore, in order to gain freedom and justice, a keen intellectual aptitude was recognized by many in that community as an imperative for their defense and prosperity. "As Henry Louis Gates Jr. has observed, people of African descent had to read and write their way to humanity in the post-Enlightenment Western world."²⁵² Thus, education was used by people of African descent as an essential tool to achieve the political objective of abolition. "Slave resistance not bourgeois liberalism," it is important to state, "lay at the heart of the abolition movement... The enslaved inspired the formation of the first Quaker-dominated abolition and manumission societies as well as the first landmark cases that inaugurated emancipation in the Western world."²⁵³ A multiplicity of tactics were employed to achieve this objective, including pursuit of education by the enslaved to amass the necessary power to influence legislators to abolish slavery. As history shows, this was no simple task.

During the antebellum period in the United States, several states passed legislation making it illegal to educate slaves. Bishop Daniel Alexander Payne, Senior Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, details in his autobiography entitled, *Recollections of Seventy*, one such law that was passed by the South Carolina state legislature. Here he is quoted at length:

"SOON after the opening of the General Assembly of South Carolina in December, 1834, a bill was drawn up by two lawyers from Charleston, it was said, who were members of the Legislature. It was fully discussed, passed both houses, and became a law to be enforced April 1, 1835. The following is the bill:

No. 2639. AN ACT TO AMEND THE LAW RELATING TO SLAVES AND FREE PERSONS OF COLOR.

Be it enacted by the honorable, the Senate and House of Representatives, now met and sitting in General Assembly, and by the authority of the same: If any person shall hereafter teach any slave to read or write, or cause, or procure any slave to read or write, such person, if a free white person, upon conviction

thereof shall for each and every offense against this Act be fined not exceeding one hundred dollars and imprisoned not more than six months; or, if a free person of color, shall be whipped not exceeding fifty lashes and fined not exceeding fifty dollars, at the discretion of the court of magistrates and freeholders before which such person of color is tried; and if a slave, to be whipped at the discretion of the court, not exceeding fifty lashes: the informer to be entitled to one-half of the fine, and to be a competent witness. And if any free person of color or slave shall keep any school or other place of instruction for teaching any slave or free person of color to read or write, such free person of color or slave shall be liable to the same fine, imprisonment, and corporal punishment as are by this Act imposed and inflicted upon free persons of color and slaves for teaching slaves to read or write.”²⁵⁴

Laws like the foregoing were legislated with one aim in mind: to serve as mental shackles to buttress the physical chains that already held slaves bound. In fact, as one abolitionist of that era records—specifically as it relates to the strategies and public policies that were implemented to control the minds of the slave population, “Nothing has been left undone to cripple their intellect, [and] darken their minds.”²⁵⁵ Forbidding slaves to read, as well as employing various brutal psychosomatic tactics by means of corporeal afflictions, aided in erecting virtual iron-cast psychological fetters that held slaves in perpetual intellectual bondage.

Frederick Douglass, fugitive slave who became an African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church minister and abolitionist preacher, recounts in his celebrated work, the *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave*, published in 1845, his own awakening to the power of intellectual enlightenment despite the efforts employed by his slave master to prevent such from happening. In detail he describes,

“Very soon after I went to live with Mr. and Mrs. Auld, she very kindly commenced to teach me the A, B, C. After I had learned this, she assisted me in learning to spell words of three or four letters. Just at this point of my progress, Mr. Auld found out what was going on, and at once forbade Mrs. Auld to instruct me further, telling her, among other things, that it was unlawful, as well as unsafe, to teach a slave to read. To use his own words, further, he said, . . . ‘It would forever unfit him to be a slave. He would at once become unmanageable, and of no value to his master. As to himself, it could do him no good, but a great deal of harm. It would make him discontented and unhappy.’”²⁵⁶

These words of Douglass’s slave master struck him at his very core. He immediately realized that embedded within them was the solution now fully disclosed, in plain sight, to his woeful dilemma. Of this grand insight he further writes,

“These words sank deep into my heart, stirred up sentiments within that lay slumbering, and called into existence an entirely new train of thought. It was a

new and special revelation, explaining dark and mysterious things, with which my youthful understanding had struggled, but struggled in vain. I now understood what had been to me a most perplexing difficulty—to wit, the white man's power to enslave the black man. It was a grant achievement, and I prized it highly. From that moment, I understood the pathway from slavery to freedom. It was just what I wanted, and I got it at a time when I the least expected it. Whilst I was saddened by the thought of losing the aid of my kind mistress, I was gladdened by the invaluable instruction which, by the merest accident, I had gained from my master. Though conscious of the difficulty of learning without a teacher, I set out with high hope, and a fixed purpose, at whatever cost of trouble, to learn to read."²⁵⁷

The perseverance essential to develop the intellectual capacity to transcend his enslaved condition eventually guided Douglass in attaining his freedom from his captors. This was, however, only one of a multitude of effects that resulted from his pursuit and embrace of scholarship. Additionally, a subsequent outcome was his ability, coupled with his resolute willingness, to effectively communicate his story in verbal, but more specifically, written form with the specific objective to broadly disseminate his ideas in order to inform the public and win over sympathizers whom he would instruct about the vile conditions of slavery. The abiding hope was that such targeted individuals would come to support the freedom movement that was garnering speed. This strategy of Douglass's was fundamentally a grass roots strategy designed to move national decision makers to favorably act against slavery as a result of growing public discontent and pressure placed upon them.

In an article entitled, "Learning Their Letters: Critical Literacy, Epistolary Culture, and Slavery in the Antebellum South," Schiller in detailing the import of Douglass's writings in shaping public opinion and moving men and women to action suggests, "such accounts revealed the iniquities of an institution that used *de jure* and *de facto* means to systematically deny the enslaved any education, which was surely crime enough for a predominantly middle class readership that included many evangelical Christians who placed an extremely high value on literacy as the means to both spiritual salvation and personal development."²⁵⁸ In other words, what is asserted here by Schiller is that as particular groups of Christians encountered Douglass's writings—such individual facts as highlighted in his quoted literary work above—would capture their imagination, and at a minimum, move them to sympathize with the slaves' plight, and at a maximum, inspire them to join the ranks of the abolitionists. As Schiller concludes, "constructing the attainment of literacy as actively defiant made it

clear that in enabling the enslaved to become educated readers or writers who could analyze and produce texts for themselves, or indeed in enabling them to become teachers of other enslaved people, literacy had, at least in an existential sense, already proved to be the ‘pathway from slavery to freedom.’”²⁵⁹

In effect, Douglass’s literacy served as a viable strategy in his quest and attainment of his personal liberty; additionally, it served as a decisive and contributing factor to the liberation of all enslaved people in the United States. Thus, the political method by which he utilized his literary skill, as aforementioned, can be categorized as a grass roots lobbying strategy because it was clearly aimed at shaping public opinion in an effort to transform the prevailing public policy of that day. Unequivocally, Douglass himself was aware of this fact for he concludes his narrative with the following words, “Sincerely and earnestly hoping that this little book may do something toward throwing light on the American slave system, and hastening the glad day of deliverance to the millions of my brethren in bonds—faithfully relying upon the power of truth, love, and justice, for success in my humble efforts—and solemnly pledging my self anew to the sacred cause,—I subscribe myself.”²⁶⁰

As African Americans struggled to attain their freedom during the antebellum period, Douglass was one of the leading voices amongst those that cultivated a larger grass roots movement committed to the emancipation of their fellow black men and women held in the iron shackles of slavery. In fact, some of the other voices that emerged came from churches founded by free African American men and women. These churches and their cadre of leadership sought to take on this colossal challenge by serving as incubators of a black intellectualism expressly directed towards liberation.

As organizations with the principal aim of spiritual uplift, the earliest accounts of African American churches in the United States reveal a broader course of strategy and action—one chartered in the directions of the social, economic, and political empowerment of the oppressed community as a whole. “Free African American Christians founded their own churches which became the hub of the economic, social, and intellectual lives of blacks in many areas of the fledgling nation,” as the Library of Congress records confirm.²⁶¹ Correspondingly, during this historical period, a highly educated and informed group of free African American clergy existed at the vanguard of the intellectual life of the African American church, as well as the broader African American community. Most of whom saw no discontinuity, but rather confluence, between their obligations as spiritual leaders and the need to call the powers to account

in redressing the social, economic, and political maladies afflicting both free and enslaved people of African descent. Subsequently, for these ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, their ministerial praxis centered itself on the socio-political liberation of their community; and found its most profound expressions within the context of the public square often lobbying as a prophetic and countervailing voice against the injustice affecting African communities in America.

In instances when public policy proposals were being formulated by the political elite that directly impacted people of African descent, clearly without the latter's input or solicitation, many free African American clergypersons were compelled to join the public debate and advocate positions that countered the claims set forth by these external voices. They offered alternative policy positions that they perceived were most in consonance with what best served to rectify black social conditions in the United States. As a prime case in point, on April 1, 1840, two free black Presbyterian pastors—Rev. Samuel Eli Cornish of New York City and Rev. Theodore S. Wright of Newark, New Jersey—jointly published a substantive and incisive critique countering politicians Theodore Frelinghuysen and Benjamin F. Butler's scheme to colonize free blacks to Africa. Cornish and Wright contended Frelinghuysen and Butler (two leading voices of the Colonization Society) assumed the responsibility of speaking for free and enslaved blacks on certain policy matters without any consultation of the free black community, and subsequently promoted their own colonization scheme. Cornish and Wright claimed that these two political voices argued that such measures ultimately served to satisfy the black community's sincerest desire for repatriation to the African continent.²⁶² The epistolary exchange of these two free African American clergymen adamantly refuted Frelinghuysen and Butler's claim, while simultaneously calling for the prompt end to the slave trade.²⁶³ They began their letter by briefly outlining the rationale behind its release for public distribution and consumption; then proceeded to outline the primary objective of their challenge. They penned the following:

“But we have another and a stronger reason for addressing to you what we have to say on the present occasion. If among those who are earnestly urging forward colonization there be any, who, it may be supposed, will weigh our arguments and judge our facts fairly—any, who can be brought to sympathize with those who are still suffering the inconveniences, the harassings, the afflictions, the perils, which that inexorable scheme ceases not to bring on them—such will most probably be found among the learned and intelligent and liberal of the Christian community. Such you are represented to us to be. Viewing you in this

light, we say not a word against your sincerity, when you profess to have in view only the promotion of our happiness—however, fully we may be convinced, that you have mistaken the channel in which your beneficence should be made to flow” (p. 4).

The lucidity of their appeal to the conscience of the “intelligent and liberal of the Christian community” demarcated an intellectual and moral challenge directed at attaining the necessary force to counter any contrived fallacies, divide loyalties, and ultimately build for themselves a vital alliance with sympathizers within the opposition’s camp. Furthermore, in their persuasive and protracted argument that followed, Cornish and Wright disclosed what they contended to be the veritable underlying motivation of the colonization plan. They concluded, “The Colonization scheme was set on foot, and is yet maintained by Slaveholders, with the view, as they have not been backward to declare, of perpetuating their system of slavery, undisturbed.”²⁶⁴ Furthermore, they were convinced that these slaveholders directly targeted free blacks because “they [the slaveholders] comprehended... whilst there remained a single prosperous colored man at the North, so long would there be a standing rebuke to the oppressor of his brethren.”²⁶⁵

In Cornish and Wright’s analysis, colonializing free blacks to Africa was simply a clandestine way of protecting and preserving the institution of slavery by eliminating key oppositional voices in that of freed African Americans. This missive does more than disclose the perspicacity and adroitness of these early African American ministers’ intellectual capacities. It reveals, on the one hand, their determination to influence the socio-political realities that affected their communities by directly lobbying politicians they presumed had the necessary influence to impact and shape public policy. On the other hand, it discloses their capacity to shape public opinion through a strategic method of communication that would potentially inspire grass roots lobbying activities on their behalf.

To more completely apprehend how the free black community during the antebellum period was informed about pertinent spiritual, social, and political issues, it is essential to consider a key communication tool created by two free black men (one of whom was a clergyperson) that sought to broadly disseminate their revolutionary ideas amongst the black population as way to mobilize and initiate grass roots political action. As early as the spring of 1827, the very same Rev. Samuel Eli Cornish—who is seen thirteen years later publicly debating with Frelinghuysen and Butler about the

Colonization Scheme—alongside John Brown Russwurm, founded *Freedom's Journal* “the first African American owned and operated newspaper in the United States.”²⁶⁶ “*Freedom's Journal*,” as James notes, “made its intentions clear from the first issue, published on March 16, 1827: ‘We wish to plead our own cause. Too long have other spoken for us. Too long has the publik been deceived by misrepresentations, in things which concern us dearly, though in estimation of some mere trifles.’”²⁶⁷ Moreover, this publication provided a distinctive and far-reaching platform for Cornish and Russwurm—as well as other leading thinkers within the African American community—to voice firsthand their views and opinions; with their primary intention being to utilize it as a form of mass media to educate, influence, and politically organize African Americans throughout the United States. “Freedom’s Journal,” as one historian suggests, “was not born solely out of the perceived need to defend African Americans as much as a desire within the black community to create a forum that would express their views and advocate for their causes. Cornish and Russwurm placed great value on the need for reading and writing as keys to empowerment for the black population and they hoped a black newspaper would encourage literacy and intellectual development among African Americans.”²⁶⁸ Additionally, “It intended to ‘arrest the progress of prejudice’ and to serve as a ‘shield’ against its evils. ‘The civil rights of a people,’ it declared, ‘being of the greatest value, it shall ever be our duty to vindicate our brethren, when oppressed, and to lay the cure before the publik.’”²⁶⁹ In other words, the very first African American newspaper’s two principal priorities from its very inception were 1) improving the intellectual capacity of the African American community through the advancement of literacy, and 2) serving as a voice of liberation and justice for that very same community by engaging directly in public policy advocacy. In summary, this vision of alleviating the conditions of intellectual and spiritual oppression is what inspired Cornish and Russwurm to take such action and launch Freedom Journal.

In consideration of the foregoing activities led by African American ecclesiastical bodies and their leadership, one may naturally conclude as a people, African Americans were concerned solely with their own plight for freedom and not that of fellow Africans back on the continent of Africa. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, their advocacy or lobbying efforts included raising their voices on behalf of Africans on the continent and in the diaspora. Indeed, “Africa,” as Skinner confirms, “always loomed large in the consciousness of early African Americans because it was that continents, economic, political, and military weaknesses that made

the slave trade possible and consequently made its inhabitants the object of prejudice and discrimination. Africa's legacy remained on the skin of African Americans in the United States and long influenced their lives."²⁷⁰ Thus a common origin and heritage, coupled with an awareness of a shared struggle, compelled African American clergy to labor to shape a just international policy toward Africa. Rev. Henry Highland Garnet is one person of note in U.S. history who is found amongst a number of distinguished African American clergypersons engaged in promoting a universal policy that addressed the African condition globally. Highlighting the efforts of Garnet, Skinner writes,

“In 1858 the Rev. Henry Highland Garnet, who had long shown an interest in Africa, organized the African Civilization Society and became its president... The principal aims of Garnet's new society were to secure the ‘immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery’ and the slave trade in the United States and in Africa; to destroy ‘prejudice against colored people in the United States,’ especially in the North, by urging the abolitionists to give jobs to freedmen and their children; to spread the gospel and enhance the civilization of Africa by cultivating cotton which, by underselling that grown in the United States, would ‘strike a death-blow to American slavery’; and to establish a great ‘center of negro nationality, from which shall flow the streams of commercial, intellectual, and political power which shall make colored people respected everywhere. This was to be accomplished by ‘the voluntary cooperation of the friends of universal freedom, irrespective of color, either by working with the Society here or assisting its objects in Africa.’”²⁷¹

In the minds of men like Garnet, there was no line of demarcation between the struggles African Americans faced in the United States and those faced by Africans on the continent of Africa or in the diaspora. In his estimation, an effective strategy for liberation necessitated a comprehensive approach that took into consideration the African population as a whole, not fragmented by physical space. Aware that their subjugation maintained global characteristics, such men advocated for a pan-Africanist political union as early as this point in history. Garnet's platform, in particular, included spreading Christianity, advancing literacy, engaging in commerce, and promoting justice. Thus, in an effort to achieve such aims, Garnet organized a political organization that would focus on amassing the essential grass roots support to mobilize men and women committed to the attainment of freedom.

After this brief survey into African American advocacy and lobbying activities during the antebellum period —exemplified primarily by the tremendous exertions of freed black clergymen—what is quite noticeable is a distinct intersectionality between

African American Christianity, intellectual development, and the pursuit of social justice, particularly through the means of grass roots lobbying strategies as a way to achieve liberation. In fact, this intersectionality appears as a common thread not only in the antebellum period but also throughout the African American experience as recorded in the history of the United States. The veracity of this claim will be echoed and substantiated repeatedly throughout this study.

Furthermore, this manifestation of Christianity was clearly a rejection of the slave masters' brand of religion that rationalized Africans' enslavement; instead, freed African American clergy developed a liberationist model of Christianity with the aforesaid quadrangular intersectionality appearing as a primary hallmark of their understanding of the Christian faith. Warnock, reflecting on the late James Cone's theological constructions that sought to suitably profile the black church's primary characteristics in the antebellum period, concludes, "...the black church, born for the cause of freedom, is the antecedent to black power and its most natural ally. In fact, the liberationist impulse was not simply one among many items on the faith agenda of the invisible institution but was the antebellum black church's very *raison d'être*.

The black church was born in protest. In this sense, it is the precursor to black power. Unlike the white church, its reality stemmed from the eschatological recognition that freedom and equality are at the essence of humanity, and thus segregation and slavery are diametrically opposed to Christianity. Freedom and equality made up the central theme of the black church; the protest and action were the early marks of its uniqueness, as the black man fought for freedom."²⁷²

The conclusion that the liberationist motif was the sole reason for the black church's existence during the antebellum period, while of tremendous import, may not withstand scrutiny as the singular motivation for the African American Church's being. Nevertheless, the claim that the liberationist motif was a primary guiding factor that determined the trajectory of African American Church engagement during the antebellum period is unquestionable. Essentially, African Americans' interpretation of Christianity with its liberationist designs expressed itself in a remonstrance manifested in an assiduous intellectual and moral appeal to the conscience of the masses, especially to those individual sympathizers inside of the politically hegemonic social collective. In fact, this mode of religio-political engagement has been a principal means by which African Americans as an oppressed group has sought to attain social change consistent with the principles of freedom and equality. It is this model of engagement that serves as a leading historical example for CLOs' present-day activities.

History of African American Lobbying During the Civil War Period

The earliest accounts of African American ecclesiastical praxis disclose its direct engagement as a leading advocate in the liberation of African Americans by challenging the politically powerful social class of the antebellum era primarily through civic actions that are today appositely categorized as both direct and grass roots lobbying strategies. During this period, such was the *modus operandi* among the most lucid African American intellectuals, pastors, theologians, and activists in their travails to attain freedom. Consequently, with the emergence of Abraham Lincoln on the political landscape, their industry bore fruit for in Lincoln they found a man whose rhetoric was sympathetic to their cause.

Lincoln was quite outspoken in relation to his anti-slavery views. In a missive to George Robertson, Lincoln avers, “When we were the political slaves of King George, and wanted to be free, we called the maxim that ‘all men are created equal’ a self evident truth; but now when we have grown fat, and have lost all dread of being slaves ourselves, we have become so greedy to be *masters* that we call the same maxim ‘a self evident lie.’”²⁷³ Hence from the very beginning of Lincoln’s campaign for the presidency against his Democratic opponent Senator Stephen Douglas, the central policy issue under consideration was slavery. The historical transcripts of the seven Lincoln-Douglas presidential debates markedly highlight this fact. Clearly, Lincoln and the Republican Party viewed slavery as a moral evil and were fundamentally opposed to its perpetuation as an institution within the United States.²⁷⁴ “We have been in the habit of deploring the fact that slavery exists amongst us. We have ever deplored it,” Lincoln shared with the audience at a political rally in Kalamazoo, Michigan.²⁷⁵

In terms of their official public policy position on slavery, Lincoln and his party advocated against its expansion into any new territories of the union. However, in terms of overall abolition, Lincoln himself clearly delineated his non-antagonistic position with regards to such a policy at his very first public presidential debate. In Ottawa, Illinois, he informed the crowd present, “I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.”²⁷⁶ That being said, Lincoln then follows this avowal with the following words: “I hold that notwithstanding all this,

there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. [Loud cheers.] I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man.”²⁷⁷

Lincoln’s public statements as quoted here speak to an existent internal struggle within the mind of a man who recognized slavery as a moral evil but also realized a certain political pragmatism essential to attaining the public office he aspired to hold, as well as the legal limitations proscribing certain direct action against slavery for the person who ultimately succeeded in becoming president. This connected with his keen perception into the prevailing visceral reactions within the hearts and minds of individuals on this subject, which divided the citizenry of the body politic into two distinct camps, informed his judgment as he realized the nation was trapped in a political quandary that could not be easily rectified. During the seventh Lincoln-Douglass debate, Lincoln himself articulates the complexity of the dilemma the nation faced, as he states, “They [Republican Party] look upon it [slavery] as being a moral, social, and political wrong; and while they contemplate it as such, they nevertheless have due regard for its actual existence among us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way and to all the constitutional obligations thrown about it.”²⁷⁸

Among African American ecclesiastical leadership, however, Lincoln admitting to the immorality of slavery as an institution without advocating for a policy that would abolish it completely provided enough reason for them to engage more feverishly in advocacy in order to influence public policy. Namely, Frederick Douglass raised his voice in an effort to push the Republican Party toward a policy of abolition by specifically lobbying Lincoln on this matter. As one historian notes, “While the rest of the nation saw the Republicans’ policy of non-extension as antislavery, Douglass and the radical abolitionists saw it as proslavery policy. In an article published in Douglass’ newspaper *Douglass’ Monthly* entitled ‘The Late Election,’ Douglass criticizes the position of Lincoln and the Republican Party in regards to slavery:

Mr. Lincoln... while admitting the right to hold men as slaves in the States already existing, regards such property as peculiar, exceptional, local, generally an evil, and not to be extended beyond the limits of the States where it is established by what is called positive law. Whoever live through the next four years will see Mr. Lincoln and his Administration attacked more bitterly for their pro-slavery truckling, than for doing any anti-slavery work.”²⁷⁹

Douglass clearly viewed Lincoln's policy on slavery as inadequate, as he became a leading critic of Lincoln and the Republican Party. Not content with verbal acknowledgement of slavery's malevolent character or its mere containment within the confines of slaveholding states, Douglass, rather, pushed for nothing less than Lincoln's leadership and support on passing abolition legislation. As a result of Lincoln's complacency, Douglass political agitation became more amplified. "This was only the beginning," as Caesar confirms, "of Douglass' militant attitudes and harsh criticisms of Lincoln and his administration. Douglass was optimistic that he would be able to push Lincoln towards immediate emancipation: 'Douglass believed he could turn the Republican Party into an Abolitionist party and Lincoln into an Abolitionist president.'"²⁸⁰

Lincoln's position, however, remained unchanged prior to his being elected President of the United States. Despite his foregoing statements to leave slavery untouched in states where slavery was legal, after winning the presidential race in November of 1860, in the minds of southern political leadership, Lincoln's personal convictions and public declarations on the immorality of slavery overshadowed his campaign promises of non-intervention. Consequently, by December of 1860, South Carolina became the first state to secede from the Union. As one historian writes,

"On Dec. 24, 1860, delegates at South Carolina's secession convention adopted a 'Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina from the Federal Union.' It noted 'an increasing hostility on the part of the non-slaveholding States to the institution of slavery' and protested that Northern states had failed to 'fulfill their constitutional obligations' by interfering with the return of fugitive slaves to bondage. Slavery, not states' rights, birthed the Civil War."²⁸¹

Soon after South Carolina's breakaway, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas, "with the highest stake in slavery seceded in response to Lincoln's election."²⁸² Thus, prior to Lincoln being sworn into office as president of the United States, the Confederacy was formed. Subsequently, war ensued. Thus, by April 12, 1861, a month after Lincoln's inauguration, "The first exchange of fire in the Civil War takes place off the coast of South Carolina at Fort Sumter, a garrison that had been occupied by Kentuckian Unionists."²⁸³

Accordingly, in context of the Civil War, African American ecclesiastical leadership was far from silent on the political front. They were active and engaged, seeking to influence the Lincoln Administration's war policies. Moreover, among the

list of policies lobbied for, comprehensive abolishment of slavery was certainly the primary concern, but it was not the only one. Additionally, African American religious leadership set policy proposals forth that included the recruitment of black soldiers' for military service in the Union forces. In September of 1861, an article written by Douglass in the *Douglass' Monthly*, argued for the Lincoln Administration's embrace of this strategy. Douglass writes,

“We insist upon it, that one black regiment in such a war as this is, without being any more brave and orderly, would be worth to the Government more than two of any other; and that, while the Government continues to refuse the aid of colored men, thus alienating them from the national cause, and giving the rebels the advantage of them, it will not deserve better fortunes than it has thus far experienced.—Men in earnest don't fight with one hand, when they might fight with two, and a man drowning would not refuse to be saved even by a colored hand.”²⁸⁴

Furthermore, Douglass' underlying justification for pushing for such a policy is succinctly surmised in the following Library of Congress record, which explicates,

“Black abolitionist leader and former slave Frederick Douglass believed that African Americans could achieve freedom and full citizenship only by participating in the war. Because Lincoln's first concern was preserving the Union, he did not publicly support the recruitment of black soldiers until after he issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863. Following the proclamation Douglass recruited two regiments of black soldiers—in which two of his own sons served.”²⁸⁵

Therefore, approximately two and a half years into the Civil war, Lincoln in a pragmatic political maneuver—with the aim of winning over the slave population as a vital political collaborator in the military campaign against the Confederacy—issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863. It declared “that slaves inside the rebelling Confederacy were ‘thenceforward, and forever free’, applying to over three million of the approximately four million slaves in the whole of America at the time of the conflict. The Proclamation only applied to the Confederacy, not the slave states still in the Union or the areas under Union Army authority; emancipation would not be granted until 1865.”²⁸⁶ Nevertheless, Lincoln's strategic war calculation, which in fact helped foster the armed rebellion of the slave population in the South against Confederate forces, coupled with Douglass's aid, support, and success in recruiting black soldiers in the north, substantially strengthened Unionists' efforts. As such, Douglass' policy recommendation was embraced by the Lincoln Administration and served as a historical milestone that liberated a substantial portion of the enslaved black

population; afforded them the opportunity to engage militarily in the preservation of their freedom; and in the case of the north, allowed for black soldiers to commit themselves to joining the military as counterparts to white soldiers in the defense of the Union, with the aim of likewise attaining and preserving universal freedom and equality for African Americans.

After the achievement of such groundbreaking public policies, it was not long before Douglass found himself lobbying again to ensure enlisted black Unionist soldiers' civil rights were protected. The prevalence of inequality and the ill-treatment black soldiers faced—not only at the hands of the enemy on the battlefield, but by fellow white soldiers in arms, as well as the military hierarchy—was certainly a rude awakening for these combatants. Knowledgeable of the varied levels of discrimination they encountered within the military, Douglass responded immediately by implementing a grass roots strategy to put pressure on the Lincoln Administration. “On Aug. 1, 1863, Frederick Douglass wrote a letter in his newspaper announcing his refusal to continue recruiting black troops for the Union Army. ‘When I plead for recruits, I want to do it with all my heart,’ he wrote in *Douglass’ Monthly*. ‘I cannot do that now,’ he said, because ‘colored men have much overrated the enlightenment, justice and generosity of our rulers in Washington.’”²⁸⁷ This harsh criticism was directed at the president in large part due to his lack of leadership in addressing the unequal treatment of black soldiers within the ranks of the military. Describing the nature of the inequality black soldiers faced, Douglass lists, “Among other things . . . black soldiers were not being paid as much as whites and were being sent on menial or dangerous missions without adequate support. Even worse, Confederate forces that captured black soldiers often either executed them or sold them into slavery.”²⁸⁸

Once again, Douglass' criticisms, and lobbying efforts in general, did not go unnoticed. In fact, they led to a face-to-face meeting at the White House with President Lincoln on August 10, 1863, where he was afforded the opportunity to directly present his views and opinions to the president. In a New York Times article entitled, “When Douglass met Lincoln,” journalist Rick Beard details their first encounter: “Upon arriving at the White House, Douglass found ‘the stairway was crowded with applicants... and as I was the only dark spot among them, I expected to have to wait at least half a day.’ But within two minutes he was ushered into the president’s office,... Lincoln immediately put his visitor at ease. ‘I know who you are, Mr. Douglass; Mr.

Seward has told me all about you,’ the president said. ‘Sit down. I am glad to see you.’”²⁸⁹

The president immediately engaged Douglass in conversation as he sought to understand the basis of his critique and gain clarity on his policy recommendations. Beard further details, “When Lincoln asked Douglass to ‘state what I regarded as the... most disheartening feature in our present political and military situation,’ the black abolitionist responded, ‘It would be the tardy, hesitating, vacillating policy of the President of the United States.’”²⁹⁰ Douglass further communicated a list of his primary concerns: “the inequitable pay for black soldiers, the need for retaliation against Confederate policies toward black troops and the need for policies guaranteeing promotion for meritorious service by black troops.”²⁹¹

Lincoln sought to address Douglass’s grievances frankly and methodically. First, he insisted on his unyielding resolve to achieve whatever course of action he adopted in relation to Douglass’s petitions, despite the pace at which he appeared to move in achieving such objectives.²⁹² “‘I think it cannot be shown’ Lincoln insisted, ‘that when I have once taken a position, I have ever retreated from it.’”²⁹³ This was done primarily to eliminate any doubt about his integrity and reassure Douglass that he is a man of his word. Moreover, he informed Douglass of the rationale behind not immediately rectifying the existent disparity of remuneration between black soldiers and white soldiers. One factor, he asserted, was that it was in black soldiers’ direct interest more so than white soldiers to engage as combatants because of the liberty a victory in war would provide them. Nonetheless, in time, Lincoln agreed, it “would ultimately be corrected.”²⁹⁴ Furthermore, he assured Douglass of his determination to take the requisite legal action to protect black soldiers against war crimes suffered on the battlefield. In recognition of this last concern, it was avowed, “‘he would sign any commission to colored soldiers whom his Secretary of War should commend to him.’”²⁹⁵

In the history of African American lobbying efforts in the United States, the meeting between Douglass and Lincoln is of particular significance. First, it is one of the earliest accounts of African American direct lobbying efforts pointedly focused on influencing a sitting president by a member of the clergy that transpired in a face-to-face meeting at the White House. This, however, was not the first meeting of its kind. The earliest documented direct lobbying meeting of this sort took place on April 14, 1862, almost a year prior, between President Lincoln and Bishop Daniel Alexander

Payne of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The following passage is quoted from Bishop Paynes's autobiography, *Recollections of Seventy Years*, which details his meeting at the White House:

“On Friday afternoon, April 11, 1862, Congress passed the bill abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia. The following Monday night I called on President Lincoln to know if he intended to sign the bill of emancipation, and thereby exterminate slavery in the District of Columbia? Having been previously informed of my intention to interview him, and having on my arrival at the White House sent in my card, he met me at the door of the room in which he and Senator Washburn were conversing. Taking me by the hand, he said: ‘Bishop Payne, of the African M. E. Church?’ I answered in the affirmative; so with my hand in his he led me to the fire-place, introduced me to Senator Washburn, and seated me in an armchair between himself and the Senator. At that moment Senator Carl Schurz entered the room and seated himself on the right of Senator Washburn. With these preliminaries, I will now state the substance of our conversation. I said: ‘I am here to learn whether or not you intend to sign the bill of emancipation?’ ... He answered and said: ‘There was a company of gentlemen here to-day requesting me by no means to sign it.’ To which Senator Schurz replied: ‘But, Mr. President, there will be a committee to beg that you fail not to sign it; for all Europe is looking to see that you fail not.’ Then said I: ‘Mr. President, you will remember that on the eve of your departure from Springfield, Ill., you begged the citizens of the republic to pray for you.’ He said, ‘Yes.’ Said I: ‘From that moment we, the colored citizens of the republic, have been praying: ‘O Lord just as thou didst cause the throne of David to wax stronger and stronger, while that of Saul should wax weaker and weaker, so we beseech thee cause the power at Washington to grow stronger and stronger, while that at Richmond shall grow weaker and weaker.’ Slightly bending his head, the President said: ‘Well, I must believe that God has led me thus far, for I am conscious that I never would have accomplished what has been done if he had not been with me to counsel and to shield.’ But neither Carl Schurz nor I could induce him to say “Yes” or “No” to our direct question.’”²⁹⁶

Whereas Bishop Payne's poignant account of his face-to-face meeting with Lincoln reveals his principal focus as being lobbying the president on signing legislation already passed by Congress that would in effect abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, it is historic in the sense that it is antecedent to Douglass's meeting with the sitting president of the United States and utilized for the stated purpose. However, when considering Douglass' account, what differentiates it from Bishop Payne's is that Douglass' petition is not only focused on the underlying aim of achieving comprehensive emancipation, but he extends the policy expectations further to include the issue of equal or civil rights—in this case, specifically for that of African American soldiers. In other words, what uniquely distinguishes this meeting is that Douglass helps lay the groundwork for a future political paradigm by articulating policy expectations

for African Americans that were based on the securing of equal rights and full participation as citizens under the law. Of all the proposed political paradigms of that era that were taken into account that would address the evolving status of African Americans and their relationship to the United States government—from colonialization schemes to separatist designs—Douglass’ proposal prevailed and has been pursued by successive generations of African Americans clergy who have also embraced Douglass and Payne’s model of lobbying as a means to gain equal rights.

Civil Rights Movement and African American Lobbying

Slavery was legally abolished in United States of America with the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment on December 18, 1865. This was approximately eight months after the Civil War ended and Lincoln was assassinated. On the one hand, African Americans across all states were free. The seemingly elusive dream of emancipation, long sought after by individuals like Frederick Douglass, Rev. Samuel Eli Cornish, Rev. Theodore S. Wright, Rev. Henry Highland Garnet, Bishop Daniel Alexander Payne, Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, and countless other individuals was realized. On the other hand, however, how were African Americans to survive as a manumitted people when the vast majority were totally deprived of the education, skill, property, and the legal protection essential to support themselves and construct lives of dignity—particularly in the face of tremendous external opposition? Furthermore, how would national decision-makers respond to the social, economic and political conditions newly freed African American persons faced? On February 12, 1963, during the year of the centennial anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, the United States Commission on Civil Rights submitted a national report on the advancement of civil rights to President John F. Kennedy that concisely answers the foregoing questions by detailing, on this issue, the “progress of the Nation during the past century.”²⁹⁷ This document submitted to the Kennedy Administration at the height of the civil rights movement merely confirmed what was evident during that turbulent era in American society in the social conflicts and tensions between blacks and whites: inequality and discrimination against African Americans were rampant.

This was a direct result of multiple factors: 1) inadequate enforcement of civil rights legislation passed after the Civil War by the federal government that would have protected and ensured equality for African Americans; 2) blatant refusal among

political and judicial leadership in southern states to adhere to federal law by claiming states' rights and passing state legislation at variance with federal civil rights legislation passed by Congress, and in the specific cases of judges, misinterpreting the federal civil rights law in such a way as to nullify and reverse its intended effect; 3) and the concerted effort of the majority of the southern white population, in particular, to wage a campaign intended to incite fear, violence, and repression against African Americans through illegal and legal means.

The Commission's report began with describing the origin and distinct utility of the concept of civil rights in the context of the United States history and concludes,

“During the closing years of the Civil War, responsible leaders began to talk about the rights to which the freedman would be entitled, and they began to call them civil rights. The term was widely used in the years following the war, and Congress recognized the relevance of civil rights to the status of Negroes by enacting in 1866 the first ‘Civil Rights’ law with the specific purpose of protecting the freed Negro from discrimination. For 100 years the question of civil rights has been intimately connected with the Negro in the United States.”²⁹⁸

Accordingly, civil rights as a concept emerged within the public consciousness in direct relation to the United States government's prevailing opinion at the quoted historical moment, which envisioned and embraced a suitably constructed policy framework for African Americans' existence in the United States as being one based on civil fairness. However, prior to universal emancipation, the absolute minimum was done policy-wise to lay the groundwork to ensure their civil rights. Before his assassination, “President Lincoln's Reconstruction Plan... went no further than to declare, ‘that any provision which may be adopted by such [former Confederate] State government in relation to the freed people of such State which shall recognize and declare their permanent freedom, provide for their education, and which may yet be consistent as a temporary arrangement with their present condition as a laboring, landless, and homeless class, will not be objected to by the National Executive.’”²⁹⁹ Furthermore, “In the closing months of the Civil War, Congress sought to develop a program of assistance for Negroes by establishing the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands. But the work of the Freedmen's Bureau, as it was commonly called, was largely in the area of relief. Only its educational program, which established schools and sought to protect the employment rights of freedmen, looked to long-range improvement in their status.”³⁰⁰ These measures provided nominal support for African Americans. Fundamentally, however, they lacked the necessary foresight, vision, creativity, and

resources that African Americans' social, economic, and political conditions demanded at that time. Instead, these actions fell drastically short of effectively addressing their predicament long-term.

Moreover, after Lincoln's assassination, President Andrew Johnson, who succeeded him in office, proved to be a staunch adversary to the cause of civil rights by opposing any policies that would secure such privileges for African Americans. "President Johnson" as the Commission's report notes, "was not sympathetic to the idea of Federal protection of equal rights for Negroes. A States rights Democrat, he believed that issues such as the protection of civil rights were reserved to the States by the Constitution."³⁰¹ Thus, throughout his tenure, he vetoed multiple bills that were intended for the stated purpose of protecting such rights. This included the prodigious Civil Rights Act of 1866, which served as a precursor to the Fourteenth Amendment and sought to codify equal protection under the law for all citizens, as it stated,

"That all persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States, and such citizens, of every race and color, without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, and penalties, and to none other, any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom to the contrary notwithstanding."³⁰²

In an attempt at persuading Congress to reconsider its position, Johnson, in a verbosely written correspondence addressed namely to the Senate, presented his rationale for vetoing the Civil Rights Act. "The bill" he argued, "in effect proposes a discrimination against large numbers of intelligent, worthy and patriotic foreigners, and in favor of the negro, to whom, after long years of bondage, the avenues to freedom and intelligence have just now been suddenly opened."³⁰³ Despite Johnson's defenses, the majority of Congressional members were not convinced. Consequently, with the requisite votes to overcome his veto, on April 9, the Civil Rights Act of 1866 became law.

The passage of this legislation was significant, as it was the original precedent within United States history that established 'equality under the law for all persons' as the legal framework to be pursued and embraced by all branches and levels of government. Moreover, as an archetypal policy and approach to governance, it laid the

groundwork for the United States Constitution to be amended in such a way as to reflect its fundamental character, which embraced equality for all citizens irrespective of race or color.

On June 13 of that same year, the House of Representatives passed the Fourteenth Amendment, and within a few days President Johnson expressed his disapproval by once again vetoing this second key piece of civil rights legislation. However, once more, the majority of the members of Congress coalesced and garnered the necessary votes to overturn his veto. Consequently, the bill was sent to the states for ratification and “was ratified on July 9, 1868, and granted citizenship to ‘all persons born or naturalized in the United States,’ which included former slaves recently freed. In addition, it forbids states from denying any person ‘life, liberty or property, without due process of law’ or to ‘deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.’”³⁰⁴

Two additional pieces of federal legislation passed during Reconstruction assist in better elucidating the choice of lobbying strategies utilized by religious leaders within the African American community during the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s in their efforts to overcome socio-political inequalities, specifically those inequalities that were later legislated and instituted in the system of *de jure* segregation.

The first policy to consider is the Fifteenth Amendment, which became law on February 3, 1870. In short, “The 15th Amendment to the Constitution granted African American men the right to vote by declaring that the ‘right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.’”³⁰⁵ And the second piece of legislation for consideration is the Civil Rights Act of 1875. As the Commission’s report discloses, “In 1875, Congress enacted the most far-reaching civil rights legislation it had ever considered. Senator Charles Sumner had introduced a bill five years earlier providing for equal rights in railroads, steamboats, public conveyances, hotels, licensed theaters, houses of public entertainment, common schools, all institutions of learning authorized by law, churches, cemetery associations, and juries in Federal and State courts.³⁰⁶ “Sumner's bill,” it notes, “was some years becoming law. But it was a new, high ground on which Congress stood when it enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1875.”³⁰⁷

Within the ten-year timeframe of 1865-1875, Congress took notable steps in passing legislation that legally secured the principle of equality within the constitutional

framework of the United States government for African Americans. However, efforts to legislatively repair the damage inflicted upon African Americans as a result of centuries of enslavement were virtually nonexistent. The allocation of property or the provision of a quality education to freedmen and women may have been topics broached in legislative chambers but they never were fully formalized in statutory perpetuity. There were a few cases, however, when promising developments transpired only to end in bitter disappointment. As is the historical example, when land was confiscated from southern owners and reallocated to freed slaves, it was only to be returned to those same white owners at a later date. Fleming in his article entitled “Forty Acres and a Mule” describes on such example and writes,

“In 1863, in addition to about 15,000 acres which were sold to negroes, other large tracts were confiscated in the parishes of St. Helena and St. Luke in South Carolina, and in Georgia and Florida. When [General William T.] Sherman reached Savannah, in December, 1864, his army was encumbered by a multitude of negroes who had followed him in his march across Georgia. After State agents from the North had enlisted many of them to fill up the quotas of their States, there were still thousands who had to be provided for. Secretary Stanton and Adjutant-General Townsend came to Savannah; and, in consultation with General Sherman and a score of negro preachers it was decided to form negro colonies on the coasts, where they could be protected by the United States forces. The negroes were unanimous in asking to be colonized away from the whites. So Sherman, with the knowledge and advice of Stanton, issued on January 16th, 1865, his famous “Special Field Order No. 15,” which set aside for the settlements of negroes all the sea islands south of Charleston, the rice-fields along the rivers for thirty miles inland from the sea, and the country along the St. John River in Florida. In the territory thus set apart for negro settlements, no white persons were allowed to live; the management of affairs was to be left to the blacks.”³⁰⁸

However, it was not long before President Johnson overturned this policy. During the course of events, the white owners who supported the Confederate rebellion that held title to this fecund acreage before its confiscation by the Union forces eventually received a presidential pardon, which, “asserted that the effect of pardon was to restore all rights of property, and ordered restoration to those whom he had pardoned.”³⁰⁹ Despite African Americans protestations, and the solidarity expressed by groups like the Freedman Bureau in the political struggle against their removal, African Americans were nevertheless forced to give up possession of their newly acquired land. Fleming recalls the history and writes, “Evictions then began; the Federal soldiers, late in 1866, were sent into some localities, and, having no great liking for the Bureau or for its wards, removed many of the latter in a summary fashion, causing much hardship. This

was a grievous disappointment to the blacks.”³¹⁰ This kind of political behavior left an already crippled community handicapped by the lingering effects of slavery, in essentially an altered condition of repression by new legal restrictions that took advantage of their political impotence. In other words, what resulted from these political maneuverings was a cycle of perpetual socio-economic subjugation; although free from the shackles that held them bound physically, they were now being legislatively relegated to a position best characterized as *de facto* servitude. This is despite the passing of momentous legislation like that of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, as well as both the Civil Rights Acts of 1866 and 1875, the true test of the potency of which would rest not in the written code alone but in their enforcement by the federal government.

Accordingly, after the passage of very first of these bills, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, it was clear the federal government would put little effort into executing such a policy. As one historian notes, when it came to enforcing the 1866 language of the Civil Rights Act, President Johnson “did nothing to implement the act.”³¹¹ In light of Johnson’s actions, as well as those of successive administrations, “The legal guarantees of emancipation and enlargement of constitutional rights for the new freedmen came close to being made a travesty by uncompromising former masters who refused to recognize in the Negro any semblance of equality.”³¹²

In addition to the inertness of the federal government to enforce civil rights law, political leadership at the state level in the South entertained a multitude of machinations, implementing those they determined would effectively undermine that very same legislation. Needless to say, this was done in an effort to preserve power while simultaneously subjugating African Americans. Out of such ruminations, Jim Crow law took firm hold in the South as legislation was passed that effected *de jure* segregation between the races. “From the late 1870s, Southern state legislatures, no longer controlled by carpetbaggers and freedmen, passed laws requiring the separation of whites from “persons of colour” in public transportation and schools.”³¹³ These foregoing factors coupled with the brutal tactics conducted by the Ku Klux Klan in the form of the widespread lynching of black men throughout southern states without reprisal, effectively reduced, “Radical Reconstruction... [to] the ‘betrayal of the Negro.’” Despite momentous legislation aimed at establishing the franchise and giving blacks a fair chance in the South, subversion of the law, intimidation, and terror ruled the black political experience, and African Americans found little solace in the Federal

government or the Supreme Court.”³¹⁴ This was in fact the socio-political context that necessitated the Civil Rights Movement.

In summary, although historic acts of Congress, as one historian indicates, “formalized the changed legal status of the Negro, emancipation did not of its own weight secure to him an equivalent change in economic, social, and political status.”³¹⁵ African Americans were largely defenseless without the necessary governmental protections or interventions essential to safeguarding their communities to prosper socio-economically. For this reason, several years after emancipation, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, sixth president of Morehouse College, minister, civil rights activist, and mentor to Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., penned in his autobiographical work, *Born to Rebel*, the following words depicting what social conditions were like that ensued after Reconstruction in communities throughout the south. He states,

“It could hardly have been otherwise than that most of the Negroes in my county at the turn of the century were wage hands, sharecroppers, and renters. Only a very small minority owned farms or were buying them. How could it be different? Thirty-five years earlier, Negroes had been freed without being given a dime or a foot of land by the federal government. Emancipated from Southern slavery in 1865, the Negro was promptly deserted by the North. Had forty acres and a mule been given each emancipated slave family, as had been proposed, the economic plight of the Negro would have been greatly ameliorated.”³¹⁶

Dr. Mays’ reflection emphasizes a broadly acknowledged fact that the political situation African Americans encountered decades after the end of slavery resulted in many persons being trapped in a seemingly inescapable socio-economic and political maelstrom. Albeit there were momentary flashes of hope as evidenced in incremental socio-economic or political advances that somewhat elevated the conditions of certain segments of the black population. “The Second World War,” in particular, as Newman confirms, “had significant effects on the lives of African Americans... During the war, one million African American joined the workforce, including 600,000 women. Over one million blacks also served in the military. Although the war gradually opened up some opportunities for African Americans in industry and the armed forces, initially they faced exclusion, or segregation and confinement to the most unattractive jobs. Aircraft and ship industries routinely excluded blacks.”³¹⁷ Such breakthroughs, however marginal, were opportunities fraught with inequalities that further accentuated a system of bigotry and oppression averse to positive change. Subsequently, in the face of such unrelenting adversity expressed mainly by the pervasive disregard or overturning of progressive policies that sought to secure equality for all citizens,

African American church leadership of various denominational stripes were compelled to act politically.

What must have been particularly disconcerting to this generation of ecclesiastical leadership was that the civil rights language amended to the Constitution of the United States—the basic and highest law of the land—was simply ignored and unenforced. Moreover, the lack of policy coherence between certain legislation passed at the state level, supporting Jim Crow law, and federal legislation that upheld equality as a right for all citizens, functioned in a bewildering manner as Jim Crow’s effects left whole communities impaired and underdeveloped. Hence, a creative response was wrought in the minds of ecclesiastical leadership to effectively address these glaring and debilitating inconsistencies. Furthermore, when one considers the lobbying strategies utilized during the civil rights movement by African American ecclesiastical leadership, it is vital to recognize the foregoing facts in order to understand why there were some strategies chosen that appear to go beyond the traditional lobbying activities outlined earlier in this study.

To clarify, when one embraces the definitions of lobbying as, “when an interest group attempts to influence policymakers,”³¹⁸ or lobbying as “the practice of trying to persuade legislators to propose, pass, or defeat legislation or to change existing laws,”³¹⁹ the civil rights movement certainly sought to do these things. However, overt coercive measures, additionally, were adopted in the form of non-violent resistance as a means to not only influence policymakers but to actually force lawmakers—including, the executive branch of government and judiciary—to execute civil rights laws already codified within the basic law of the land. In other words, a tremendous part of their lobby exertions was in the direction of pressuring national leadership to do what ought to have been done heretofore as mandated by the Constitution of the United States.

Considering the specific approaches employed to attain that specific end, Newman et al. purport, “The struggle in the 1950s was dominated by two powerful civil rights strategies. One was very old; the other was new and had a dramatic form. The first is exemplified by a series of lawsuits begun in 1938 that finally resulted in outlawing racial segregation in education in 1954. The second, mass nonviolent protest began with the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott led by Martin Luther King Jr., in 1955.”³²⁰ Expressly considering the first strategy, Thurgood Marshall as the chief legal counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)

led the national judicial struggle against racial segregation in higher education. Newman et al. additionally indicate, “Between 1938 and 1954, the NAACP argued five higher education cases before the Supreme Court.”³²¹ And as NAACP records confirm, “By the 1950s the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, headed by Marshall, secured the last of these goals through *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), which outlawed segregation in public schools.”³²²

Even with the achievement of these judicial milestones, the lingering question that remained was what was to prevent the political leadership from adopting a similar course of action as that of the past that disregarded established civil rights law by not enforcing it? True to form, subsequent attempts were made by governors and other politicians in the South to pursue the very same sequence that disregarded the law. For example, Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus ignited a political firestorm by his “blatant defiance of [the] Supreme Court school desegregation rulings” which eventually provoked federal intervention.³²³ As a result of this historical pattern of being denied justice, “it soon became clear to black Americans in the South that the legal battles won by the NAACP would become living realities only when blacks took a more direct hand in exercising the legal rights they had won. The first thrust toward direct action needed to make the accumulated legal rights of black Americans meaningful came in 1955-56 when the black population of Montgomery, Alabama, were successful in a boycott to end segregation on the city’s buses under the direction of the youthful Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.”³²⁴ This second strategy served as a means not only to reverse these draconian laws and secure legislative victories; more importantly, it served as a way to ensure such victories were executed and enforced.

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s unique ability to influence lawmakers and transform public policy certainly distinguished him as one of the most effective lobbyists of twentieth century. University of Notre Dame law professor and associate dean, Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, concurs and asserts that: “Indeed, under the consensus definition of lobbying—any attempt to influence the actions of government—the most successful ‘lobbyists’ include American heroes such as Patrick Henry, Susan B. Anthony, and Martin Luther King, Jr.”³²⁵ However, a key variable that has contributed to setting him apart and elevating him to the celebrated status he occupies in the minds of people is the grass roots method he promoted that inspired mass public participation in nonviolent protest against unjust laws, all directed at the end of pursuing public policy change.

In his notable work, *Stride Toward Freedom*, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. outlines the early events that transpired which gave birth to the Montgomery bus boycott. Additionally, he reveals the intellectual sources that aided in shaping his political methodology. Accordingly, its philosophical underpinnings found its origin in the works of individuals like Henry David Thoreau, Walter Rauschenbusch, Reinhold Niebuhr and Mahatma Gandhi.³²⁶ For King, Thoreau's "Essay on Civil Disobedience" provided, "a serious intellectual quest for a method to eliminate social evil."³²⁷ King was challenged, as many are who read Thoreau's words, specifically on the question he raises in regard to men and women's blind acceptance of unjust laws. Thoreau interrogates, "Unjust laws exist: shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavor to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or shall we transgress them at once?"³²⁸ Specifically considering Jim Crow law and its blatantly oppressive character that stifled freedom, human potential, and creativity; the words of Thoreau challenged King in such a way that he apprehended such laws were merely letters void of respectability and demanded being transgressed as a right. In short, they were immoral; as such, to not adhere to them was no wrongdoing because they were intentionally fabricated to be repressive strictures, serving against the interests of the oppressed who unwittingly followed them.

Additionally, King insisted, the Social Gospel principles espoused by Walter Rauschenbusch "had done a great service for the Christian Church by insisting that the gospel deals with the whole man, not only the soul but his body; not only his spiritual well-being but his material well-being."³²⁹ Rauschenbusch's writings persuaded King that the Gospel calls men and women to work toward the eradication of social, economic and political conditions that entangled human collectives in webs of despair. Moreover, Niebuhr's Christian Realism assisted King to "recognize the complexity of man's social involvement and the glaring reality of collective evil." For it is Niebuhr, in his 1932 work *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, who also contended influencing policy must go beyond mere appeals by groups beleaguered by the machinations of more politically powerful social collectives. Instead, such oppressive conditions necessitate coercive measures as requisite accompaniments to achieve liberation. Niebuhr concludes, "that nonviolence is a particularly strategic instrument for an oppressed group which is hopelessly in the minority and has no possibility of developing sufficient power to set against its oppressors."³³⁰ In a sort of prophetic utterance back in 1932, Niebuhr further notes in that work, "The emancipation of the

Negro race in America probably waits upon the adequate development of this kind of social and political strategy. It is hopeless for the Negro to expect complete emancipation from the menial social and economic position into which the white man has forced him, merely by trusting in the moral sense of the white race. It is equally hopeless to attempt emancipation through violent rebellion.”³³¹

Lastly, Gandhi’s expressed philosophical approach—exhibited in his political activity in the quest to achieve India’s independence from British colonial domination—was perhaps most influential of all, in terms of the streams of intellectual stimuli King mused. “Prior to reading Gandhi,” King explains, “I had about concluded that the ethics of Jesus were only effective in individual relationships. The ‘turn the other cheek’ philosophy and the ‘love your enemies’ philosophy were only valid, I felt, when individuals were in conflict with other individuals; when racial groups and nations were in conflict a more realistic approach seemed necessary. But after reading Gandhi, I saw how utterly mistaken I was.”³³² King gathered from Gandhi’s writings and example the idea that an oppressed social group like that of which he emerged could utilize Jesus’ teaching on love and nonviolent engagement as a political weapon in the struggle to attain civil rights. Thus, the twinning of these two Christological precepts was King’s settled upon instrument of defense to be exerted by participants in the civil rights movement; in such instances constructive creative political tension was initiated as a means to directly challenge unjust laws. “Gandhi,” as King credits, “was probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful effective social force on a large scale.”³³³ Additionally, it was Gandhi who also recognized the limitations of disenfranchised social groups’ lobbying efforts without effective coercive actions to move government. “‘In my humble opinion’ he declared, ‘the ordinary methods of agitation by way of petitions, deputations, and the like is no longer a remedy for moving to repentance government so hopelessly indifferent to the welfare of its charge as the Government of India has proved to be.’”³³⁴ As King’s approach to socio-political transformation went beyond mere petitioning to multiple forms of grass roots agitation, it is clear this lesson of Gandhi’s did not go unnoticed.

King’s entertaining of these varied streams of thought equipped him with an assortment of tools that he would be able to employ when the time presented itself to address the injustices faced by the African American community in the segregated city of Montgomery, Alabama where he served as pastor during the 1950s. On December

1, 1955, with the arrest of Rosa Parks—who refused to adhere to a bus driver’s demands to give up her seat to white passengers boarding his bus—the time came for King to experiment with the ideas he had encountered in study. In the face of rampant discriminatory practices and social inequalities met daily by African Americans in many and varied socio-economic spheres, this one incident with the public bus system of Montgomery served as a catalyst that would eventually challenge and help overturn the entire system of *de jure* segregation in the United States.

Yet, what immediately followed was an initial proposal by the local clergy of Montgomery to boycott the city bus for a day.³³⁵ However, what resulted was a yearlong boycott that concluded on December 20, 1956. In the end, the boycott successfully achieved the policy demands set forth by the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA)³³⁶ that ultimately eliminated the discriminatory practices African Americans had long endured on city buses for years.

Concealed within the boycott strategy, however, was a deeper and more compelling philosophical and theological formulation that drove King and helped garner and organize grass roots support. In effect, it went beyond solely that of instigating the adverse economic impact the boycott would have on the bus company. Concerning this less conspicuous motivational factor King avers, “that what we were really doing was withdrawing our cooperation from an evil system, rather than merely withdrawing our economic support from the bus company.”³³⁷ He goes on to say, “Something began to say to me, ‘He who passively accepts evil is as much involved in it as he who helps perpetrate it. He who accepts evil without protesting against it is really coöperating with it.’ ... From this moment on I conceived of our movement as an act of massive noncoöperation. From then on I rarely used the word ‘boycott.’”³³⁸

King’s awakening to the idea that individuals or groups are active participants in evil when they patronize institutions that exploit or subjugate others—whether or not such individuals or groups are merely indirectly sanctioning and buttressing another’s or one’s own oppression—motivated him to action as he inspired others to adhere to this principle of noncooperation with evil. To further clarify, the other key insight revealed in King’s awakening is the fact that essentially through the oppressed collectives’ patronizing of such unjust institutions, they as a subjugated class were essentially empowering their own repression.

Nevertheless, King’s revelation of noncooperation with evil served to enlighten the minds of many people unaware of the ways they were inadvertently contributors to

grave injustices. Consequently, beginning first in Montgomery and then extending across the nation, this principle of noncooperation with evil through political agitation and nonviolent action resonated among the millions of men and women King attracted to the Civil Rights Movement as they systematically disengaged from oppressive activities in which they were once unwittingly engaged.

In describing the history that followed as result of the success of the Montgomery led protests by King, Newman suggests, “The Montgomery bus boycott had demonstrated the potential for nonviolent mass protest in the South...”³³⁹ The issue facing King and his Montgomery clergy cohort was how to effectively organize a national movement whose local model was now being adopted and implemented in multiple states. The founding of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) was the answer to this objective. SCLC records confirm,

“As bus boycotts spread across the South, leaders of the MIA and other protest groups met in Atlanta on January 10 – 11, 1957, to form a regional organization and coordinate protest activities across the South. Despite a bombing of the home and church of Ralph David Abernathy during the Atlanta meeting, 60 persons from 10 states assembled and announced the founding of the Southern Leadership Conference on Transportation and Nonviolent Integration. They issued a document declaring that civil rights are essential to democracy, that segregation must end, and that all Black people should reject segregation absolutely and nonviolently. Further organizing was done at a meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana on February 14, 1957. The organization shortened its name to Southern Leadership Conference, established an Executive Board of Directors, and elected officers, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as President, Dr. Ralph David Abernathy as Financial Secretary-Treasurer, Rev. C. K. Steele of Tallahassee, Florida as Vice President, Rev. T. J. Jemison of Baton Rouge, Louisiana as Secretary, and Attorney I. M. Augustine of New Orleans, Louisiana as General Counsel.”³⁴⁰

Fundamentally, the primary reason for founding the SCLC was to engage in the struggle for civil rights for African Americans that would result in public policies that were consistent with the high principles of equality articulated the United States Constitution. Additionally, although the actions and protests were frequently staged on the local level, the abiding aim of moving policymakers on all levels of government—including, state and federal—to support the policy agenda espoused by the Civil Rights Movement was paramount and was, therefore, continually at the forefront of the minds of the organization’s leadership.

Irrefutably, the policy transformations that were achieved on the local, state, and national levels were a direct result of the support King was able to garner from

ecclesiastical leaders and their institutions within several states. In fact, as Newman confirms “the SCLC developed much of the civil rights movement’s infrastructure, its ‘movement centres’, by coordinating local church-based movements that sprouted in several southern cities.”³⁴¹ In order to achieve their policy objectives, ecclesiastical bodies, as well as a variety of black led secular groups, were exercising direct nonviolent action in an effort to end segregation and achieve civil rights. “Armed only with the technique of nonviolence civil disobedience,” as one historian describes, “the tactics of direct-action protest, and the determination to prevail, black America was on the march. For the rest of the decade, they sat-in, boycotted, went on freedom rides and picketlines, and staged massive voter registrations campaigns.”³⁴² King’s brand of grass roots lobbying had proved effective by providing an ideal prototype for grass roots engagement that was coercive enough to effectively move government.

It is also important to clarify that the Civil Rights Movement was an expansive undertaking with numerous actors involved in the struggle to gain equality for blacks. King was certainly a preeminent figure amongst a cadre of great leaders. However, leaders like Ella Baker, Thurgood Marshall, A. Phillip Randolph, Bayard Rustin, and a host of other persons unnamed in this study played significant roles in eradicating Jim Crow law and segregation within the United States of America. Furthermore, black ecclesiastical leaders in the South were complemented with their counterparts in northern cities who were just as committed to the movement, often implementing their unique approaches to addressing inequalities. For example, specifically in New York City during that era, Taylor discloses, “The most prominent ideological group among the black clergy of Brooklyn comprised Afro-Christian liberals... It included Reverends Gardner C. Taylor, of Concord Baptist Church, Sandy F. Ray, of Cornerstone Baptist Church, John Coleman, of Saint Philip’s Protestant Episcopal Church, William Orlando Carrington, of First African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and George Thomas of Brown... Memorial Baptist Church.”³⁴³ He goes on to confirm, “These prominent black pastors, who had close ties to the politically powerful, were not just seeking political accommodation. Instead, they saw themselves as ambassadors of their race. They believed that their mission was to use their influence to better the black community. They became close to local and state officials and politicians not to gain personal advantage but to win concessions for the community.”³⁴⁴ These pastors sought to build relationships with their elected officials

as a way to petition them so as to achieve legislative victories for the communities they served.

As is evident, the Civil Rights Movement was not a movement where King was the sole preeminent figure, nor did it originate with King. He followed in the steps of courageous African American clerical leadership, as he also joined ranks with other champions from the black community engaged in the struggle for justice. Nonetheless, what distinguishes King is his mode of activating grass roots support to achieve legislative and public policy victories, specifically by means of noncooperation with evil and utilizing nonviolence as means of coercion. In describing the commitment of the grass roots to King's religio-political philosophy, "Bayard Rustin, one of the organizers of the 1963 March, wrote that year in *Liberation*:

... children as young as six paraded calmly when dogs, fire hoses and police bullies were used against them. Women were knocked to the ground and beaten mercilessly. Thousands of teen-agers stood by at churches through out the whole country, waiting their turn... Day after day the brutality and arrests went on. And always, in churches, hundreds of well-disciplined children awaited their turns."³⁴⁵

Such displays of widespread civil disobedience forced the President and Congress to act legislatively to address the issue of civil rights.

Furthermore, in the context of the Cold War with the Vietnam War waging, U.S. credibility as a global leader was under attack by various governments as the images of brutal assaults by law enforcement against nonviolent black protestors were broadcast throughout the world. "The difficulty of managing this problem was magnified" as Dudziak contends, "by the fact that the civil rights movement sought to use international concern to increase pressure on the Kennedy administration for civil rights reform."³⁴⁶ Civil rights leaders were quite successful in their approach, and as a direct result of their exertion of domestic and international pressure. In the end, "President Kennedy responded by calling for landmark civil rights legislation, explaining his course of action in a televised address to the nation."³⁴⁷ As a result of an assassin's bullet, however, President Kennedy never saw the fruition of his undertaking which helped initiate the drafting of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964. "President Johnson," whose administration saw it to completion, "told Congress that the finest legacy to the assassinated President Kennedy would be passage of civil rights legislation..."³⁴⁸ Thus, on July 2, 1964, with Martin Luther King, Jr. in attendance and before a nationally televised audience, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was signed into law

by President Johnson. The lobbying efforts of the Civil Rights Movement achieved its primary objective in that the law now “prohibited discrimination in the workplace, public accommodations, public facilities, and agencies receiving federal funds, and strengthened prohibitions on school segregation and discrimination in voter registration.”³⁴⁹

In summary, the politicization of the masses through the tactics encouraged by King, coupled with a clear strategy to influence legislation, proved a potent and effective force in creating societal change. Additionally, the role the television media played in captivating domestic and international audiences served as an additional measure of putting pressure on the President and Congress to take action in regards to civil rights; it simultaneously broadcasted to the nation the power of lobbying. It is, therefore, no coincidence that after all the political activities directed at influencing Congress and the administration by African American clergy, as well as other Christian groups during the 1960s, exponential growth subsequently occurred in Christian denominational bodies and groups establishing permanent lobbying offices in Washington, D.C., to put pressure on Congress to address their political concerns.

A Brief History of Moral and Social Reform in the 19th and 20th Centuries

A primary objective of this study is to investigate what historical factors contributed to the exponential growth of CLOs after the 1960s. It is argued from the onset of this work that the leading factor that contributed to this surge in the 1970s was directly consequential to the successes of the Civil Rights movement. The history of African American lobbyism is therefore explored in particular depth. Furthermore, the adoption of key aspects of this type of ecclesiastical political practice in the 1970s by church groups outside of the African American community should not be viewed as unrelated to or disconnected from the example provided by the Civil Rights movement. Despite the ethnic or racial composition and the denominational, social, or political penchants of the CLOs instituted in the 1970s, the facts show, specifically in relation to justice-oriented CLOs, the Civil Rights movement functioned as a chief inspirational source in their founding. As a consequence—after this watershed moment in history—lobbying as an ecclesiastical political practice was accordingly embraced by Christian groups whose religious and political values were at variance, absent, incongruent, or antagonistic to the aims of the Civil Rights movement.

The insights of Michael Corbett and Julia Mitchell Corbett are particularly relevant at this point. “Politics,” they aver, “exists because people have *conflict* concerning values.”³⁵⁰ This axiom is self-substantiating when considering the values of disparate religious groups and their political activities historically in the United States. In fact, lobbying additionally functioned as an indispensable political method for these varied organizations to address their disagreements about such values, work out the appropriate policy methods to employ to realize shared values, determine the highest rank of individual values amongst a broader set, and settle differences due to clashes of self-interests, whether values were shared or not.³⁵¹

Certainly, this conflict of political values amongst religious bodies did not originate during that explosive period of growth of CLOs in the 1970s; it existed even prior to the founding of the United States. Neither can it be argued that distinct ecclesiastical bodies did not engage in lobbying in the early history of the U.S. government, whose theological and political values were at variance or directed towards different aims than those of the African American actors explored. In fact, there are ample historical illustrations of politically active church bodies with divergent political values that engaged in lobbying during the nineteenth century. This includes individual clergypersons, denominations, and volunteer mission societies.

A revealing example of ecclesiastical bodies of this type positively emerges during the antebellum period. To gain a broader perspective of how this phenomenon emerged, it is essential to describe the social challenges of that period. Mintz sheds light on this matter: “A nightmare haunted early-nineteenth-century Americans—the specter of social breakdown. In countless sermons, letters, and editorials, thoughtful Americans denounced rising lawlessness, poverty, prostitution, irreligion, and violence, which, if not stopped, threatened to destroy the new nation’s democratic experiment.”³⁵² Social disintegration best characterized the moral condition of the new nation—one in which mob violence ruled; sexual immorality was the norm; drunkenness was prevalent; and lynchings and duels were the violent means embraced to settle disputes.³⁵³ Additionally, substantial and continual influxes of European immigrants between the 1830s and 1850s—with their diverse cultural expressions—in tandem with growing urbanization, catalyzed a distinct pluralism and liberalism that challenged “traditional structures of authority.”³⁵⁴ This bleak picture of American society as detailed by various scholars clearly alarmed certain clergy of that period.

Consequentially, it is the social climate as immediately described in which the Second Great Awakening³⁵⁵ emerged. The impetus for this spiritual and theological movement, Matthew's argues "is... understood as a conservative assertion of a new mode of religious authority by ministers who, fearful of losing their traditional role in New England society, tried to tame the rising democracy. It provided new channels not only for social control but also for social service which some scholars have said was but a manifestation of the former."³⁵⁶ Although recent scholarship seeks to challenge the foregoing premise and interpret the revivals of this period in terms of "an institution building process, a cultural revitalization movement, a women's awakening" or a "democratizing process within evangelical Protestantism that was set in motion by the American revolution,"³⁵⁷ there are contemporary scholars who continue to hold to the fact that these revivals functioned as a "force for social discipline and for social reform."³⁵⁸ Thus, in light of the delineated moral challenges and their broader societal effects following the Revolutionary period, the considered clergymen viewed these behavioral patterns as transgressions to their purported religious convictions; while on the other hand, they also undermined not only American democracy but the spiritual, social and political influence these clergymen held. Correspondingly, Mintz argues,

"For those New Englanders who had seen their political power collapse with the demise of the Federalist Party and who were dismayed by the growing separation of church and state, reform seemed a providential means of restoring order and morality to American society. Following the War of 1812, New England adopted a new stance toward the rest of the nation; many embarked on a missionary crusade to make their region's values the nation's."³⁵⁹

As explored previously, the weakening of the Puritan model of governmental engagement evidenced on the national stage at this point in history, propelled these clergymen forward in an effort that challenged disestablishment and sought to garner state recognition in support of their religious values campaign. Therefore, it can be argued that the Second Great Awakening was more than just an attempt to halt the descent of certain orthodoxy; it was, additionally, an awakening on the part of these clergymen to actively exert their influence in order to gain greater social and political control.

Revivalism was the primary method of engagement employed by these ecclesiastical proponents to "both organize and revitalize the various segments of the nascent American religious and social order in the first third of the nineteenth century."³⁶⁰ Their brand of revivalism during that era took on a distinct character.

Revivals and camp meetings swept across various segments of American society like a spiritual tidal wave. “The revivalism connected with the Great Second Awakening,” Sutton articulates, “became notorious for boisterous camp meetings, aggressive proselytizing and unusual preaching practices, but it also involved ratiocinative theological adjustments and regular congregational expansion.”³⁶¹ The theological foundations, specifically, that spurred these revivals on were rooted firmly in both Calvinist and Arminian doctrine. Traditional scholarship attributes a great deal of responsibility for this theological pivot to Timothy Dwight who, during his tenure as president at Yale College, “transformed religious life at the college and, together with his students, rejuvenated the congregational churches of New England.”³⁶²

It was during this era that Christian missions and societies began to multiply and thrive, as leading voices established an array of charities to address particular social concerns. A prime example of this form of social engagement is that of Joseph Tuckerman. “Tuckerman,” as one historian notes, “was convinced religion alone offered an insufficient answer to the problems of the poor and needy. Eager to do something more than merely ameliorate conditions, he sought out underlying causes of poverty, juvenile delinquency, and alcoholism and would remedy these problems through what he called ‘scientific charity.’”³⁶³ The systematic manner in which he sought to address poverty led to the creation of various volunteer missions and the “country’s first agency to coordinate public charities.”³⁶⁴ The concept of Benevolent Empire seeks to define this wave of social engagement during this point in history.³⁶⁵

At first glance, these actions on the part of the church bodies of that era appear and are often defined by scholars as nonpolitical in nature, as they aim to achieve various social objectives. Walls, however, argues, “American missions have tended to think of themselves as nonpolitical... Non-Americans have seen continual political implications in their activities.”³⁶⁶ That is to say, ecclesiastical groups may seek to define their religious and social activities in a nonpolitical manner, however, such actions inherently have political implications. Moreover, the contemporary labeling of this period as the Benevolent Empire is quite apropos, revealing the underlying political objective of empire building through charitable means. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the expression of revivalism and social engagement explored did indeed embrace spiritual and moral suasion as a means to achieve various social reform objectives. The argument that the historical trajectory of this movement remained solely apolitical simply cannot be justified. Mintz elucidates this point:

“Over time, however, the reform impulse became institutionalized and bureaucratized, and increasingly reformers came to believe that to be successful their programs needed the help of state and local governments. Establishment of public school systems, prisons that rehabilitated rather than punished, and asylums where treatment of the mentally ill was accordingly to the most advanced medical principles—all required government action. By the 1840s, more and more temperance advocates called for legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor...”³⁶⁷

In other words, there are ample historical examples related to the national dissemination of revivalists’ religio-political values that appositively metamorphosed into political action reflective of the contemporary understanding of lobbying. They are evinced in the following evangelical movements of the nineteenth century: prison reform, temperance, abstinence, education, and efforts to end prostitution. On lobbying as a political approach, Swierenga adds, “Instead of battles in Washington and statehouses over economic benefits and favors, ethnoreligionists stress[ed] fights over prohibition of alcohol, abolition of slavery, Sunday closing laws, parochial-school funding, foreign-language and Bible usage in public schools, anti-Catholic nativism and alien suffrage, sexual conformity and capital punishment, and a host of lesser crusades.”³⁶⁸

Each crusade above had its distinguished voices and societies leading the charge. In the fight against prostitution, the New York Mary Magdalen Society and the New York Female Reform Society were particularly influential. The latter actually “lobbied for state laws that would make male solicitation of prostitutes a crime.”³⁶⁹ Amongst the Quakers, a leading advocate of the temperance movement was Neal Dow who successfully lobbied the state government of Maine, which ultimately “passed the nation’s first statewide prohibition law in 1851.”³⁷⁰ Dow held the firm conviction “that the state, in interest of public safety, had to remove temptation.”³⁷¹ Lastly, Horace Mann a proponent of democratic education, was an Unitarian minister and legislator who skillfully navigated between political and educational spheres as “he called for a program of ‘common schools,’ meaning that the school should be the common element in the life of all the people”³⁷² in the United States.

The historical record affirms that this spiritual movement which started with clear aims of societal moral reform resulted in greater population control through political means, while simultaneously bolstering the authority and broader influence of the voices and denominations leading the efforts. As explored, lobbying, amongst a range of tactics, was clearly implored to achieve policy objectives. Moreover, this

reactionary pattern to the loss of social and political influence and the call for a recovery of a certain orthodoxy emerges in United States history as a recurrent theme amongst evangelicals of similar theological and doctrinal persuasions. Two such resurgences are evident in the early and mid-1900s respectively. As teaching of Darwinism in public schools began to challenge long-standing doctrinal and theological orthodoxy, preachers began to emerge in an effort to reinstate their religious and socio-political authority. Likewise in the years the Civil Rights movement was gathering momentum, a reactionary conservative evangelical movement also began to foment, ultimately leading to the founding of the Christian Right.

Starting with the resurgence that emerged in the early 1900s, David Masci, who in an article published by the Pew Research Center titled, “Darwinism in America: The evolution debate in the United States”, sheds light on the controversy surrounding the teaching of Darwinism in U.S. public schools. “While many scientists defended Darwin,” Masci reveals, “religious leaders and others immediately rejected his theory, not only because it directly contradicted the creation story in the biblical book of Genesis, but also because—on a broader level—it implied that life had developed due to natural processes rather than as the creation of a loving God.”³⁷³ Accordingly, Darwinism presented a formidable challenge to religious orthodoxy and instigated a binary polarization not only in society but also amongst Protestant groups, as liberal and conservative Protestant groups emerged as distinct adversaries. Masci further details,

“By the early 1920s, evolution had become perhaps the most important wedge issue in this Protestant divide, in part because the debate had taken on a pedagogical dimension, with students throughout the nation now studying Darwin’s ideas in biology classes. The issue became a mainstay for Protestant evangelists, including Billy Sunday, the most popular preacher of this era. ‘I don’t believe the old bastard theory of evolution,’ he famously exclaimed during a 1925 revival meeting. But it was William Jennings Bryan, a man of politics, not the cloth, who ultimately became the leader of a full-fledged national crusade against evolution.”³⁷⁴

A national reactionary grass roots movement against the teaching of Darwinism in public schools emerged with evangelicals leading the charge. Billy Sunday was a leading proponent in this struggle as “he preached a crude version of the ultraconservative evangelical theology of the middle of the 19th century. He denounced all sinners, scientists, and liberals in unmeasured terms... In social and economic matters Sunday was rigid reactionary.”³⁷⁵ Sunday’s battle against Darwinism and

Protestant liberalism in effect would aim to preserve traditional religious, social, economic, and political authority. According to certain scholars, Sunday's moral crusade shrouded its underlying economic and political intentions. Giffin affirms, "Far from challenging business enterprise, he [Sunday] invested it with religious sanction."³⁷⁶ For this reason, Sunday found himself publicly supported by business tycoons John Leland and John D. Rockefeller and the like, both of whom showered praises on the firebrand preacher.³⁷⁷

The second influential person of note during this period is William Jennings Bryan. Although described above as "a man of politics, not the cloth," William Jennings Bryan was a man deeply rooted in the evangelical conservative Protestant community of that era with far-reaching influence. This 'man of politics', alongside men of the cloth like Sunday, systematically organized for political action among the evangelical ecclesiastical groups they spoke for with the primary aim to pass legislation on the local, state, and national levels that would prohibit the teaching of Darwinism in public schools. "At the urging of Bryan and evangelical Christian leaders," in fact, "evolution opponents tried to ban the teaching of Darwin's theory in a number of states. Although early legislative efforts failed, evolution opponents won a victory in 1925 when the Tennessee Legislature overwhelmingly approved legislation making it a crime to teach 'any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible.'"³⁷⁸ Here, again, lobbying to achieve political objectives lucidly emerges on the part of Christian conservative of that era.

The struggle waged against Protestant liberalism on the part of Protestant conservatist ecclesiastical entities is further demarcated as the 1900s progressed. The National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), one of the earliest conservative Protestant permanent lobby organizations in Washington, D.C., that remains active to-date, was created as a response to the growing influence of the Federal Council of Churches—its liberal counterpart—which was established in 1908. The Federal Council of Churches, which would in the 1950s expand to become what is known today as the National Council of Churches, maintained its justice-oriented and anti-poverty mission. This organization was particularly influential as an ecumenical partner in the Civil Rights Movement. The NAE and its leadership, on the other hand, elevated conservative values, as they also determined to influence national policies. Like the Federal Council of Churches, the NAE concluded lobbying was a viable means to do so. For this reason, after the NAE was founded, "the first among many action items was the 1943 opening

of an office in Washington, D.C., to help on a number of fronts, such as supporting evangelical chaplains, assisting mission agencies in dealings with the State Department, championing the cause of religious broadcasting to the Federal Communication Commission, and defending religious liberty.”³⁷⁹ Moreover, “Because the demands were great, NAE called Clyde Taylor, a Baptist General Conference pastor in New England, to oversee the strategic office.”³⁸⁰ This D.C. office allowed for immediate and direct contact with national decisionmakers to influence U.S. domestic and international policy. These illustrations repeatedly reveal how conservative evangelical revivalism of the 1800s and 1900s, in its attempt to achieve social reform, preserve orthodoxy, and maintain spiritual, social, economic, and political influence, openly embraced lobbying as a viable means to enact change.

Early Catholic history in the United States reveals a similar trend. Although more politically powerful Protestant groups viewed Romanism with a heightened suspicion and held a strong aversion toward the Catholic Church generally, this did not deter Catholics’ efforts to influence American politics. John Carroll, the first Catholic Bishop in the United States, initially chose a political stance of nonalignment that helped the Catholic Church to transcend partisan politics and pursue the political interests of the denomination. “‘I have observed,’ Carroll said, ‘that when ministers of Religion leave the duties of their profession to take a busy part in political matters they generally fall into contempt.’ Nevertheless, Carroll was willing to enter the political arena to defend Catholic interests when he felt they were under attack.”³⁸¹ Carroll’s foremost political strategy was to forge a distinct American identity amongst Catholics. Byrnes writes that Bishop Carroll promulgated “that Catholicism and Americanism were not mutually exclusive...”³⁸² While Bishop Carroll promoted a definitive embrace of Americanism for Catholics in the newly constituted nation, other Catholic bishops, at later dates, sought instead to catholicize America. In fact, Carey reveals, “By the 1850s Catholics were mounting their own crusade to make America Catholic. Few were as bold or, given the nativist mentality of the times, as arrogant and aggressive as New York’s Bishop John Hughes in articulating the Catholic design. Hughes preached:

Everybody should know that we have for our mission to convert the world, including the inhabitants of the United States, the people of the cities, and the people of the country, the officers of the navy and the marines, commanders of the army, the Legislatures, the Senate, the Cabinet, the President, and all! ... There is no secrecy in this. It is the commission of God to His Church, and not a human project.”³⁸³

It was this very same Bishop Hughes who, during heightened social tensions in New York, “marched into city hall and warned those authorities that New York’s Catholics would retaliate and burn the city if a single Catholic church was harmed. ‘I come to warn you for your own good,’ Hughes confidently told New York’s mayor.”³⁸⁴ This direct confrontation with the mayor of New York on the part of Bishop Hughes—despite his belligerent tone—is a clear example of a grass tops direct lobbying strategy with the obvious objective of protecting Catholic interests.

Further, it is interesting to note that the Catholic church’s position on slavery lead to its acquiescence for most adherents and downright embrace for others. “Many Catholics,” Carey affirms, “not only accepted the American institution of slavery, they also found support for it in Catholic teaching, justifying it on biblical, historical, and theological grounds.”³⁸⁵ While Protestant denominations were being torn asunder because of polarized stances on the issue of slavery, the Catholic church did not experience a similar institutional rupture.³⁸⁶ In fact, the economic benefits that came from the institution of slavery that Catholics enjoyed buttressed their union and prompted them to a deafening silence on the controversial political issue.

It was, however, during the late 1800s that the Catholic church’s embrace of lobbying as a chief means to influence legislation to secure church interests on both the local and state levels was becoming normalized. This is particularly evident in relation to Catholic education. A relevant example is what took place at the Illinois state house after the passing of a controversial education bill. “In 1889 Republicans in the Illinois legislature,” Byrnes reveals, “passed the Edwards Law stipulating that only schools sanctioned by the local school boards could satisfy compulsory attendance requirements. The bishops of Illinois used the 1892 election to express their anger at this attack on their schools. ‘We,’ they told their people, ‘denounce this law as a violation of our constitutional rights... Let us use all right and honorable means to have it repealed.’”³⁸⁷ These bishops’ call to Catholics throughout the state to work toward the repeal of the Edwards Law is reflective of a grass roots defensive lobby strategy, which at that time set in motion political force that ultimately upended that law.

In the following chapter, we will further investigate the characteristics and historical rise of Christian Lobby Organizations as a political phenomenon in the context of the United States.

Chapter 2

Christian Lobbying Organizations (CLOs)

Defining Christian Lobby Organizations

As is shown in the foregoing chapter, Christians—as individuals, groups, and representatives of their denominational bodies—have from the earliest history of the United States of America engaged in the political practice of lobbying as they sought to influence local, state, and national governmental policies. In many cases, their activities were directed at the achievement of particular policy aims; and with the actualization of such aims the strategic or organizational lobbying tactics that were set into motion did not necessarily perpetuate institutional missions. There were, however, pioneering Christian groups that concluded early on in U.S. history that a permanent presence in Washington, D.C was advantageous to ensuring a range of policy concerns or that interests were considered and enacted legislatively. Hence, Christian Lobbying Organizations (CLOs) came into being. Some of the first, established in Washington, D.C as church-sponsored offices, focused solely on influencing federal legislation.

As stated in the introductory section of this study, the first CLOs in U.S. history can be traced back to the end of the nineteenth century. In the wake of the Civil Rights Movement, however, tremendous growth is evident in the establishment of these kinds of organizations in Washington, D.C. Robert Zwier, addressing the evolution of this political phenomenon and the public perception surrounding it, confirms,

“Less visible in this public debate about religion and politics has been the presence of several religious organizations which have set up their political shops in Washington for the purposes of monitoring and influencing government actions as well as educating and activating citizens. Since the turn of the century and especially in the period following World War II, several denominations have answered the call to proclaim the word of the Lord through their social action agencies, including offices in the nation’s capital. Since the activist sixties, several other groups representing individual citizens have contributed to what Berry (1977) calls the ‘advocacy explosion,’ a plethora of groups promoting political activity and (sometimes) principled public policy. Together, these church and religious groups reflect the opportunities and challenges that attend the mix between religion and politics.”³⁸⁸

Unmistakably, the duality that is reflected in the very early formation of CLOs remains today; it is based on the convergence of religious conviction and political praxis with

the primary purpose of merging the two in order to transform socio-political conditions within American society. Hence, this political method known as lobbying has served as a workable organizational means for Christians to express such convictions by working together to secure legislative interests held in alignment with the core doctrines or principles of the corresponding traditions that established the CLO in question. Therefore, for over a century, as Zwier contends, CLOs have sought—at varying times, degrees, and methods—to be a bona fide force in national politics through their lobbying exertions that are motivated by their faith.

Moreover, with the 1960s functioning as a watershed moment in political activism, specifically in light of African American clerical leadership’s strategic approach to political organizing, the emulation of CLOs’ lobbying strategies undoubtedly fueled their expansion in Washington, D.C., in the decades to follow. The widespread influence the Civil Rights Movement had on ecclesiastical leadership broadly, some of whom were firsthand participants while others witnessed it through the varied forms of broadcasted media, was highly effective in revealing the power of moving political leadership through the church’s political engagement on Capitol Hill. To reiterate, the Civil Rights Movement helped ignite the unprecedented growth in the number of CLOs based in the nation’s Capital following the 1960s.

Yet what delineates CLOs from other lobbying entities, religious and secular, is precisely their individual claim to be inspired to legislative activism by Christian conviction. Therefore, it must be stated that when defining CLOs, the term ‘Christian’ broadly refers to the wide-ranging spectrum of religious bodies that claim either in name or mission an affiliation with the life or teachings of Jesus Christ. Their traditions, doctrines, theological perspectives, and biblical hermeneutics are as vast and varied as the denominational groupings that have founded the respective CLOs under consideration. The primary thread of commonality among them is their personal claim of an association in some self-defined manner with Jesus Christ. Additionally, it is this connection that defines lobbying as an approved expression of religious practice for them, which results in a form of public piety apposite for this type political engagement.

The second commonality amongst CLOs is their disposition to engage continuously in lobbying activities with the aim to influence public policy. For these groups lobbying is not a temporary phenomenon; it is something that is to be done permanently. Furthermore, not all of the early-established CLOs remain active to-date. Thus, when considering *organizational permanence* as a key-defining characteristic of

CLOs, this concept is best understood as a principal intent of such organizations that directs them toward such an end. In reality, many of the earliest CLOs have succumbed to vicissitudes of time. Nonetheless, their original aim to maintain an abiding organizational presence in the nation's Capital in order to influence Congress is what sets them apart as a unique categorization and phenomenon.

As it relates to the earliest established CLOs and to those in existence today, their missions range from focusing on a single policy issue to an array of issues that are essentially inspired, as already mentioned, by their respective interpretation of Christianity. Additionally, the earliest records of the policies focused on by CLOs reveal two distinct categorizations—social justice-oriented CLOs, or values-oriented CLOs focused on issues surrounding moral choices and behaviors.

The first categorization is also moral in nature and concerned about human conduct. Its moral premise is focused on eliminating systemic injustices that perpetuate inequality or obstruct civil rights within the populace. Thus, social justice-oriented CLOs primarily seek to support and institute fair and just policies that preserve one's freedom to develop without obstruction. Some of their policy initiatives include the development and strengthening of governmental social services aimed at improving the general welfare of the most impoverished and vulnerable members of society. Other legislative priorities entail issues of war and peace, including both anti-war or pro-military intervention campaigns in pursuit of justice. Furthermore, there are a range of international policy concerns these organizations support, from working toward poverty eradication in the developing world to humanitarian interventions as warranted.

This first category differs from the second grouping, which aims to transform citizens' moral conduct as evidenced in personal behaviors. For example, the policy campaigns of the past that focused on temperance would fall under this description. Today, family values-oriented CLOs fall under this category with their policy focus on what is commonly labeled amongst such groups as traditional family structures, pro-life, and other human sexuality issues.

Within any given CLO, policies reflecting both categories can exist. There are also those CLOs, within both categorizations, that are known to have pursued certain distinguishable self-interests, in terms of attaining, strengthening, or protecting certain legal privileges and advantages. There are others known to pursue a nationalist agenda, lobbying for certain foreign policy proposals advantageous to U.S. national interests generally. These main categories of policy considerations as identified in the earliest

CLOs' lobbying activities remain current as primary aims of contemporary CLOs and broadly define, although not exclusively, their lobbying pursuits.

It is important to highlight a particular distinction between CLOs and secular lobbying organizations. Among CLOs, the power to sway politicians with campaign contributions or votes is seriously impeded. Unlike secular lobbying groups, "because of their tax status, many religious advocacy groups are barred from supporting or opposing candidates in elections."^{389 390} Such legal restrictions inherently serve to deter certain corruptive practices associated with the field of lobbying. In recent history, however, through an executive order signed by the Trump administration, measures were taken to loosen such constraints. The actual effect is questionable. On May 4, 2017, the Washington Post, quoting Anthony D. Romero, Executive Director of the ACLU, reported, "Today's executive order signing was an elaborate photo-op with no discernible policy outcome."³⁹¹ The measures that curb CLOs support or opposition of candidates remain largely unaffected. Accordingly, this legal restriction placed on CLOs activities, in particular, has historically had the effect of checking and discouraging certain immoral acts that have come into public purview concerning secular lobbying groups.

Although candidates' voting records or recognition of their support for particular policy initiatives is often disseminated amongst CLOs' membership as a means to influence the public opinion, organizational campaign contributions to a candidate directly from a given CLO are illegal. Doing opposite would jeopardize their very existence as an organization. Furthermore, individual members of CLOs may choose to financially support a candidate on their own, but certainly not officially in the name of the CLO in question.

Relating to the theories explaining CLOs' activities, quid pro quo exchange process and providing expert information and using that information are both key to understanding their work. In terms of the latter first, as will be shown in later sections, certain CLOs view themselves as experts in particular policy areas because of their in-depth knowledge on a policy matter. Repeatedly, this results primarily from their direct involvement in the field that relates to the subject matter at hand. For example, the Roman Catholic Church's lobbying arm is known to provide expert information, for example, in relation to policies that address homelessness because of the extensive work Catholic Charities conducts amongst the homeless population in the United States. The sharing of this firsthand knowledge is viewed as critical in helping

legislators make informed policy decisions as to how to effectively address homelessness. Besides, CLOs view the provision of this type of information as a way to promote policy solutions that are grounded in a Christian moral framework that may otherwise go unexpressed without their advocacy.

Now in specific consideration of ‘quid pro exchange process’ as a theory: although certain legal restrictions forbid the support or endorsement of candidates by CLOs, the fact that they inform their membership of candidates’ support or lack of support of favored policies indubitably creates a situation of reciprocity. That is, although less overt, the exchange manifests itself through a candidate’s constituents connected to the respective CLO being informed of his or her support of a policy position. This can inevitably impact the candidate’s election chances. There rests the relationship of exchange.

The lobbying strategies for CLOs consist of both direct, grass roots and grass tops initiatives. In short, these organizations are known to influence legislation in the following ways as described: “inform public opinion; inform constituents; sign coalition letters; correspond with policy makers; meet with officials; issue news releases; initiate letter/email campaigns; write policy papers; give testimony at hearings; participate at demonstrations; and produce congressional scorecards.”³⁹² Although measuring the exact impact of all these activities in relation to actual policy outcomes is very difficult due to the complexity of the legislative process, there are a few viable methods CLOs employ. For example, novel public policy issues initiated by a CLO that results in the achievement of legislation in alignment with the original idea is one means of measuring lobbying impact. A second is directly drafting legislation in conjunction with a congressional office. A third way to determine lobbying impact is through verbal or written feedback from a given legislator’s office about the effect of a given CLOs efforts in determining their decision. Lastly, not all CLOs view favorable policy outcomes as the only viable means to measure the success of their lobbying efforts. Some argue that lobbying impact can be measured in terms of the actual verbalization of a moral high ground that is based on the principles of justice, equality, fairness, or some other principle as derived from the Scriptures.

CLOs' Organizational Structures

A historical panorama of CLOs' varying organizational structures reveals a multiplicity of characterizations that can be employed to explain their shared designs. However, Zwier, in his detailed study on religious interest groups, suggests a model worth employing to best comprehend the structural commonalities amongst CLOs as a distinct phenomenon. "There are various ways," he writes, "to categorize religious interest groups (size, ideology, longevity, etc.), but for our purposes, we will distinguish among them primarily on the basis of constituency. Following the typology of Weber (1982; 1986), we observe that the major types of religious interest groups are church-based groups, individual membership groups, and coalition groups."³⁹³ In terms of CLOs specifically, all three distinctions are relevant. However, the first two categories—church-based/denominational groups and individual memberships groups—serve as the key classifications that provide insight into the organizational structures of the CLOs investigated in this study. These two classifications also assist in understanding the basis of a given CLO's theological perspective, which inspires political action on the part of its supporters. Additionally, each gives insight into the political base of support that undergirds the practical aspects of building and asserting political influence to achieve legislative victories.

The first grouping, as Zwier contends, "consists of the Washington offices of churches and denominations."³⁹⁴ This first classification is represented by those CLOs that were instituted by a denominational authority, who chartered their missions, and whose activities are perpetually guided by the directives of the corresponding denominational leadership structure. In other words, these institutions are not autonomous lobbying organizations, but are, in fact, subject to the decision-making processes instituted by the church's hierarchy or to the approved governing contrivances established by church authority. In both cases, such CLOs are bound to denominational controls that ultimately determine the policies they are to pursue. The USCCB and the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society are two specific organizational examples that fall under this classification, out of numerous similarly constituted CLOs of this type.

In the specific case of the USCCB, its Office of Government Relations (OGR) performs its lobbying work as the Catholic Bishops of the United States and the U.S. Virgin Islands mandate its responsibilities as a collective body. The OGR's official

function as described by the USCCB is that it, “represents the USCCB before the U.S. Congress on public policy issues of concern to the bishops... [And it] coordinates and directs the legislative activities of the USCCB staff and other church personnel to influence the actions of the Congress.”³⁹⁵ Although the executive function of coordinating their lobbying activities rests in the hand of the OGR staff, the Catholic Bishops articulate the vision, and determine the office’s direction and pace. As is the case with all of the other endeavors the USCCB engages in, its lobby work included, the primary role of the bishops is to: “address and respond to a variety of issues and concerns that affect the life of the Church both within the church community and within contemporary society.”³⁹⁶ Moreover, the time-honored, extensive and rich tradition of Catholic Social Teaching—articulated by the Holy See for generations—serves as a fountain of intellectual and spiritual inspiration and guidance that helps inform Catholic decisions about sought-after policy initiatives. It is a source that helps move Catholics of different ethnic backgrounds and political opinions to converge in support of the various policies lobbied for by the OGR. Lastly, the 196 archdiocese/diocese across the United States is a vast grass roots and grass tops network that is engaged regularly, and mobilized through various communication strategies by the OGR, as a means of influencing the legislative process in Washington, D.C.

Similarly, the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church is bound to pursue the public policy mandates they receive. These mandates are outcomes of the authoritative procedural processes established by the United Methodist Church for guiding their work. Unlike the OGR, however, which is beholden to the Catholic hierarchy, the United Methodist Church mandates are established through resolutions approved by the larger church body at the General Conference. As such, the specific responsibilities of the General Board of Church and Society are framed by the United Methodist Church in the following terms: “Church and Society is the agency within the Church that educates, advocates and connects in an effort to implement the Social Principles and other policy statements of The United Methodist Church. Continually advocating with policy makers, organizing the grassroots, and educating future leaders, Church and Society works to live faithfully, seek justice, and pursue peace.”³⁹⁷ As disclosed, the principal parameters set to guide their legislative activities are the results of a more inclusive and democratic decision-making process.

Accordingly, the Social Principles and resolutions that are passed during the General Conference of the United Methodist Church serve as the chief guide to direct

the General Board of Church and Society's efforts by providing a broad framework of priorities to govern their lobbying work. Moreover, the *Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church*, which is a compilation of all those approved resolutions, and also contains the Social Principles, is the essential resource for churches in general, and the General Board of Church and Society in particular, to consult as it details the United Methodist Church's official positions on social and theological concerns. Alongside the *Book of Resolutions* is the *Book of Discipline*, another resource basic to understanding the theological underpinnings that undergird the lobbying activities of the United Methodist Church.

It is essential to further stress that the Social Principles and resolutions are policy positions that are produced collaboratively, through consultation with various parties within the United Methodist Church.³⁹⁸ Subsequently, all newly drafted principles or resolutions are presented at the General Conference, where they are voted on and either approved or disapproved. The effect of this process is threefold. First, key segments within the vast network of people—estimated in the millions—that comprise the membership of the United Methodist Church, directly contribute to shaping the future direction of the General Board of Church and Society's lobbying efforts. Their shared decisions determine the General Board of Church and Society's policy agenda for the foreseeable future. This is one clear outcome of this consultative and democratic process. Second, this process serves as a remarkable educational exercise for the larger church body. This exercise entails critical policy concerns being brought to the church's attention. The policies are communicated, studied, and discussed. Ultimately, they are voted on. Next, the United Methodists involved in this process, in turn, inform their local congregations about the policy positions they have learned of and passed. Thus, the educational exercise is extended. Lastly, this process assists, simultaneously, in bolstering grass roots support for forthcoming lobbying activities that the General Board of Church and Society later advises. As the resolutions that are intended to direct the activities of the General Board are drafted and agreed upon by the larger Christian body, the support of the resultant policies, and the accompanying grass roots activities to realize them, are inherent consequences. In other words, with the views and the opinions of the majority winning out, there is already a vested interest for that same majority to utilize its political power through lobbying to achieve the aims of its convictions as is already codified in the resolutions and principles they themselves developed and passed.

As evident, the democratic process established by the United Methodist Church by which decisions are made on the public policy rubric to be pursued by the General Board of Church and Society stands in stark contrast to the process established by the USCCB, which guides the lobbying efforts of the OGR. Additionally, the United Methodist's process is arguably more advantageous in harnessing grass roots support. Nonetheless, both the USCCB and the General Board of Church and Society are obligated to follow the directives as set forth by their respective governing authorities. Also, the decision-making processes established clearly vary amongst other CLOs found in this classification, specifically regarding the public policy areas in which they are directed to engage. Nevertheless, what unites this classification into a unique grouping, first and foremost, is the fact that they are bound to a church or denominational structure that mandates the respective CLO's lobbying activities.

In addition to this common denominator, there are additional characteristics that these types of CLOs mutually share. Zwier discloses seven distinctly held attributes worth noting. At length, he is quoted as stating, "Although there are some organizational differences within this category, the Washington offices of church-based groups generally have the following characteristics:

1. The Washington offices were most often established initially for the purpose of monitoring government actions that affected the churches and their various ministries. Only secondarily or later in time did the office take on the responsibility to present the official policy statements of the denomination to government offices and to engage in more active policy advocacy.
2. These offices tend to have a longer history in Washington than other religious groups, with many of them dating back to the early 20th century and to the period after World War II...
3. The Washington office is part of the church hierarchy, with authority vested in church leaders most of whom are not located in Washington, D.C. In addition, there is a well-established pattern of local congregations and regional assemblies.
4. The Washington staff are often church bureaucrats, almost half of whom came to the Washington office from pastorates or other positions in the church, rather than careers in politics.
5. The Washington staff tend to have relative longevity in their positions, reflecting their careers in the churches and the stability of their supporting organizations...
6. The Washington offices are quite small; most have no more than two or three professional staff members. These individuals have multiple responsibilities competing for their time, including monitoring government policies, educating church members, advocating public policies, and so forth.

7. It is obvious but vitally important to recognize that political activity is not the primary mission of the churches, so the Washington offices must constantly fight for attention and resources within organizations dedicated to other priorities.”³⁹⁹

In Zwier’s categorization above, there are obvious instances where certain CLOs that fall into this designation only partially meet the criteria he suggests. Nevertheless, the findings from his extensive research into many religious interest groups provide some valuable insights into some of the key similarities denominational- or church-based CLOs share.

Pertaining to the second classification, CLOs that fall under the category of “individual membership groups” are recognized by the number of dedicated individuals or institutional bodies that support their lobbying work through various levels of engagement. The range of involvement varies, and could include: participating in grass roots or direct lobbying activities as organized by the CLO in question; or, making financial contributions in support of furthering the CLO’s work on Capitol Hill. What distinguishes the CLOs in this second classification is that these groups are recognized, in part, for their focused thematic approach to policy. In other words, a particular religious, social, or political issue, or set of issues serves to attract and mobilize a political base amongst a range of Christian traditions that coalesce to support the activities of the CLO in question. CLOs like Bread for the World (Bread) or Concerned Women for America (CWA) fall into this category type.

In the case of Bread, its mission has proven effective in garnering national grass roots support: “Bread for the World is a collective Christian voice urging our nation’s decisions makers to end hunger at home and abroad. Moved by God’s grace in Jesus Christ, we advocate for a world without hunger.”⁴⁰⁰ This idea of Christians laboring to end world hunger by advocating for public policy transformation, as a faithful response to God’s grace in Christ, has won over tens of thousands of women and men of the Christian faith to join in that effort as members of Bread. This also includes thousands of churches dispersed throughout the United States, representing diverse denominational backgrounds, that have covenanted to support the organization’s work. Additionally, Bread’s members, volunteers, activists, and supporters—spiritual, moral, and financial—have historically come from various denominational authorities, often with sustained backing from the highest levels of their church leadership.

The strength of Bread's lobbying impact is fortified by its political calculation to ensure and, if need be, develop, grass roots networks within all 435 Congressional districts, with a particular focus on Congressional areas where the leadership is, for various reasons, essential to the passing of legislation Bread is in support of. "Bread works," as it candidly admits, "in partnership with churches, campuses, and other organizations to mobilize Christians and others in congressional districts and states."⁴⁰¹ Accordingly, the outcome of this political approach Bread touts as, "a track record of winning bipartisan legislation that helps hungry people feed their families." Bread's leadership also admits the strength of its political approach is directly allied with the indispensable role its members play in lobbying Congress, and advances, "[the organization is] successful because our grassroots network of members and activists works in concert with national denominations, networks, and organizations supported by Bread's staff in Washington, D.C., and around the country."⁴⁰²

Differing from church-based/denominational CLOs, individual membership groups, like Bread, are not beholden to some ecclesiastical hierarchy or governing authority. Consequently, an internal organizational decision-making process determines the policy agenda pursued by these CLOs. Certainly, the processes vary from case to case. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of autonomy in determining legislative priorities. In general, however, Bread's annual legislative agenda emerges as follows: First, senior-level management, with the input of staff policy experts, initiates the process of selecting legislative priorities for the following year. Next, individual members, board members, key activists, church, and denominational partners' opinions are solicited through polling, as they are presented a selection of policy options to choose from. Lastly, the different opinions are weighed and then senior staff ultimately decides which recommendations will be presented to the board of directors for final approval. As demonstrated, Bread's senior management is the primary driving force behind the selection of the policy agenda for each year.

Similarly, CWA falls under the second classification of individual membership groups. In addition, CWA's leadership has developed an effective thematic approach that has successfully resonated with certain segments of Christian women nationally. Affinity toward the organization's mission has led to hundreds of thousands of women, as well as men, joining their ranks. CWA's mission is defined in the following terms: "Concerned Women for America protects and promotes Biblical values and Constitutional principles through prayer, education, and advocacy."⁴⁰³ CWA further

asserts, “We are the nation’s largest public policy women’s organization with a rich history of over three decades of helping our members across the country bring Biblical principles into all levels of public policy.”⁴⁰⁴ This task of Christian women leadership at the helm of infusing a moral framework for socio-political existence into the body politic of the United States, as derived from their hermeneutical approach to scripture, has proven to be an effective grass roots organizing strategy. Comparable to Bread, CWA’s broad appeal is a product of a potent, yet simple, ideal mined out of a bibliocentric outlook that ultimately encourages socio-political engagement as an expression of faith.

Distinct from Bread, however, CWA lobbies on both the state and federal levels. Its vast grass roots network is organized to monitor, promote, and, if need be, contest select legislation in state capitols throughout the nation. Despite this increased level of lobbying activities, CWA maintains a strong focus on Congress. Furthermore, the coordination of its state and federal lobbying activities is conducted primarily out of its headquarters. The organization’s ability to execute this nationwide lobbying effort is attributed to “several active departments in our national office in Washington, D.C.”⁴⁰⁵

Accrediting its vitality to its national network of members, CWA asserts, “CWA is a unique blend of policy experts and an activist network of people in small towns and big cities across the country working to address mutually held goals and concerns.”⁴⁰⁶ These goals and concerns, as it pertains to specific legislation, are, however, determined by staff in Washington, D.C. CWA activists and members frequently submit policy recommendations to the national office, but before any action is taken in the field, staff in Washington, D.C., must approve it. The senior management team, with the input of key legislative staff, navigate the legislative course of action for the organization.

In terms of additional attributes shared amongst CLOs, like Bread, CWA, and other organizations that fit into this second classification, Zwier provides the following insights: “The second type of group is the individual membership group; these groups tend to have the following characteristics:

1. Individual membership groups, more than church groups, were established to have an impact on public policy, either through direct lobbying of government officials or indirectly through mobilizing group members to contact government officials...
2. The groups are generally not subunits of larger organizations; in many cases the Washington office is the headquarters for the entire group operation. Some of these groups have local chapters, but there is substantial variation in terms of their activity and their perseverance.

3. Both formal and informal accountability with the organization is more ambiguous. Staff members are to some degree accountable to the membership, to some degree accountable to a governing board, and to some degree accountable to large donors. There is also considerable freedom for them in their day-to-day activities.
4. The Washington staffs of these groups tend to have somewhat shorter job tenure; ... Although about a third of these people came from pastoral careers, another one-fourth came from careers in education. These staff members are also more likely to have held positions in government.
5. The organizations themselves tend to be younger than the church groups... only 18% had been in Washington for more than 30 years.
6. The Washington staffs, like those of church groups, are typically small, and the staff members fulfill multiple roles. One critical difference, however, is that the Washington office includes the chief executive officer of the groups, so there are additional responsibilities carried out through this office.
7. Unlike the church groups, the members have usually joined these groups for political reasons.”⁴⁰⁷

Zwier’s foregoing summation of the shared characteristics that uniquely delineate CLOs in this classification, noticeably includes some of the structural features already highlighted vis-à-vis Bread and CWA. Furthermore, within the additional characteristics set forth by Zwier that Bread and CWA hold in common is that both organizations were founded in the 1970s, long after many of the church-based CLOs were founded in Washington, D.C. Lastly, they were both organized expressly to impact public policy.

Furthermore, Zwier informs, “Within this category of groups, there are some critical differences. Some groups focus on public policy advocacy, others stress citizen education, and others operate more like research institutes or think tanks. Some combine all three approaches, but with different emphases.”⁴⁰⁸ He goes on to reveal, “Another type of individual membership group is more concerned with policy research, hoping to influence government policy by the power of their arguments rather than the force of their lobbying efforts.”⁴⁰⁹ Naturally, as in the case of the categories of church-based religious interest groups Zwier offers, this second categorization provides a general, not comprehensive, framework to understand the basic organizational structures of these lobbying institutions.

In conclusion, what is also of particular interest is that of Zwier’s characteristics above, none explicate in any detail whatsoever the significance of advocacy as a unique function, alongside, or embedded in, lobbying for these groups. This is specifically absent from both his first and second categorizations of religious interest groups. In

fact, he seems to use the terms interchangeably. However, in his study, he briefly mentions the evolution of advocacy as an espoused secondary function for the church-based religious interest groups after their founding. Accordingly, he argues that church-based interest groups' initial role in Washington was primarily to observe "government actions that affected the churches and their various ministries."⁴¹⁰ He goes on to reveal, "Only secondarily or later in time did the office take on the responsibility to present the official policy statements of the denomination to government offices and to engage in more active policy advocacy."⁴¹¹ In other words, Zwier's research leads him to conclude, although this is not stated explicitly, that many of the very first church-based religious interests groups initially established their lobbying organizations out of self-interest. As he claims, their offices were intended to keep an eye on congressional matters in direct relation to their denominational interests. Only afterwards were a range of policies suggested and advocated for by these groups.

Conversely, unlike most church-based groups, Zwier also points out several individual membership groups were, from their founding, purposefully "established to have an impact on public policy."⁴¹² Although he does not utilize the term 'advocacy' in their cases, that is precisely what various groups in this classification were doing in their respective understanding—advocating for a particular cause or causes dear to themselves. The additional distinction he does make, however, is that their advocacy took shape in the form of lobbying Congress, as he puts it, "either through direct lobbying of government officials or indirectly through mobilizing group members to contact government officials."⁴¹³

To best understand this second classification of CLOs, it is essential to apprehend these policy pursuits were directly linked to certain compelling principles derived from their founders' understanding of the Christian faith—principles that continue to be embraced by their membership bases. This is particularly critical to understanding what drives individual membership groups—as well as church-based groups for that matter—which engage in lobbying because they view themselves essentially as advocates for greater causes that transcend their personal interests. Although this is not immediately identifiable from Zwier's characteristics of individual membership groups' impetuses for coming into existence, as an underlying consequence, however, it is a distinction worth noting in order to appreciate any differences or similarities between lobbying and advocacy. Thus, this leads to the next

section, where both concepts, as key terms within the context of CLOs' political activities, will be investigated in further detail.

Christian Lobbying in Juxtaposition to Christian Advocacy: What's the difference?

In relation to the terminology employed to define CLOs' activities aimed at influencing Congress, researchers, politicians, journalists, and in very rare cases CLOs themselves, may apply the terms 'lobbying' and 'advocacy' interchangeably. Although these words typically share a close tie in describing the work of CLOs, each possesses its own unique distinctions that aid in fuller apprehension CLOs' endeavors. Furthermore, each has profoundly different connotations, arousing certain visceral reactions, particularly amongst the members of the larger public. Specifically in light of multiple corruption scandals connected with lobbyists that were already mentioned in first chapter of this study, a lingering residue of high skepticism remains a psychological stain on the minds of much of the populace in regard to lobbying. Hence, the very thought of lobbyists instinctively invokes images of cunning political maneuverers, willing to accrue favors from corrupt politicians through varying means of bribery, no matter the cost or effect. Consequently, CLOs largely shy away from the term 'lobbying' and are very cautious as to how they employ it.

On the other hand, the word 'advocacy'⁴¹⁴ is of peculiarity and prevalence in CLOs' communication strategies. It is broadly used by CLOs with notable regularity, as one of the key self-defining terms that best communicates to the public the essential purpose of their existence and mission. Additionally, 'advocacy' certainly carries more of a positive connotation; specifically, it intimates the images of an individual or group who is willing to raise their voice as a champion for a cause or policy of particular significance, beyond their self-interests, and at all costs. Contrary to the images lobbyists may evoke, advocates are broadly recognized for their passionate, dedicated, honorable, and sacrificial nature—the likes of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a leader in the Confessing Church who advocated in resistance to the Nazi regime; Martin Luther King, Jr., an advocate for nonviolence social change during the Jim Crow era; or even the biblical character Moses, who was chosen by Jehovah to advocate to Pharaoh for the liberation of the Hebrew slaves, may come to mind. For these reasons and intimations, the term advocacy is fully embraced by CLOs of both the denominational/church-based and individual membership types.

A quick assessment of various CLOs mission statements that tersely informs the larger public of their primary organizational aims readily substantiates this claim. Beginning first with the OGR of the USCCB, the organization candidly promulgates, “Under the leadership of the Domestic Policy Committee of the Conference of Bishops, the USCCB advocates on behalf of the poor and vulnerable on a wide range of legislative matters to promote family and child-friendly policies, access to health care, the preservation of rural life, the reformation of welfare policies, and the consideration of issues of poverty.”⁴¹⁵ It further avers, “The USCCB advocates for policies that protect and respect human life and dignity, with special concern for those who are unborn, disabled, or terminally ill.”⁴¹⁶ In relation to education, it asserts, “We also advocate for legislation that assists parents in defraying the costs of choosing the type of schooling most appropriate for their children, including education in Catholic schools.”⁴¹⁷ Lastly, regarding international affairs, “The USCCB engages in policy development and advocacy on concerns related to international justice and world peace.”⁴¹⁸ The term advocacy is used with overwhelming frequency in support of the USCCB’s lobbying activities.

Likewise, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA) places weighty emphasis on the concept of advocacy when detailing its mission. The ELCA lobbying office on Capitol Hill communicates its mission and activities in the following terms: “Through participation in the church’s Advocacy Department the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs staff help to prioritize issues for the church’s public policy activity. The Advocacy Department develops the ELCA Advocacy Plan for review by the Division for Church in Society’s Board and Church Council setting the direction for church wide advocacy efforts for a two year period.”⁴¹⁹ Comparably, the Presbyterian Church U.S.A adopts similar language. “The Presbyterian Office of Public Witness is” it says, “the public policy information and advocacy office of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). Its task is to advocate, and help the church to advocate, the social witness perspectives and policies of the Presbyterian General Assembly. The church has a long history of applying these biblically and theologically-based insights to issues that affect the public—maintaining a public policy ministry in the nation’s capital since 1946.”⁴²⁰ Equally, the Episcopal Church does not deviate from the messages purported by the other CLOs of this kind: “The Episcopal Church Office of Government Relations represents the priorities of the Episcopal Church to the policy community in Washington, D.C. Through engaging Congress, the Administration, and

U.S. government departments and agencies, we aim to shape and influence policy on critical issues, highlighting the voices and experiences of Episcopalians and Anglicans globally. We strive to equip Episcopalians to become advocates themselves. All of our work is grounded in the resolutions of General Convention, the primary governing and legislative body of the Church.”⁴²¹

CLOs that are categorized as individual membership groups reflect the exact same tendency. To reiterate, Bread declares its mission as being, “a collective Christian voice urging our nation’s decision makers to end hunger at home and abroad. Moved by God’s grace in Jesus Christ, we advocate for a world without hunger.”⁴²² CWA, also positioning advocacy as a predominant factor guiding its work, declares, “Concerned Women for America protects and promotes Biblical values and Constitutional principles through prayer, education, and advocacy.”⁴²³ Numerous other CLOs, of both classifications, produce a trend consistent with the foregoing organizations as related to the use of ‘advocacy’ as the prevailing standard.

What is also conspicuous is the absence of the term ‘lobbying’ with respect to CLOs’ specific communication tools that delineate their organizational objectives; albeit, the definition of lobbying—as understood in its simplest form as seeking to influence legislation or Congress—is certainly present. To further substantiate this point, the USCCB clearly emphasizes the principle of lobbying without ever mentioning the term in the OGR official statement that describes its work. It specifies, “OGR coordinates and directs the legislative activities of the USCCB staff and other church personnel to influence the actions of the Congress.”⁴²⁴ Likewise, the ELCA contends the end result of its advocacy efforts is to “effectively impact public policies.”⁴²⁵ The term lobbying is nowhere stated. This is also the case for the Presbyterian U.S.A. Office of Public Witness that particularizes several methods it employs in order to effectively lobby Congress without ever mentioning the word. It reports, “staff members visit national policy-makers and their staff, write letters, make phone calls and occasionally testify before Congress or facilitate the testimony of church leaders.”⁴²⁶ Predictably, the Episcopal Church Office of Government Relations, like all the other foregoing denominationally based CLOs, evade the term; nonetheless, they state it by definition as an adopted and primary political strategy. The denomination’s official communication posits, “The Episcopal Church Office of Government Relations represents the priorities of the Episcopal Church to the policy community in Washington, D.C. Through engaging Congress, the Administration, and

U.S. government departments and agencies, we aim to shape and influence policy on critical issues, highlighting the voices and experiences of Episcopalians and Anglicans globally.”⁴²⁷

Identical to the denominationally based CLOs, the patterns for individual membership-based CLOs on this topic reflect the same trend. Bread provides a unique example of this type of organizational classification. Essentially, the term ‘lobbying’ is nonexistent on most of its public communication, except, as assumed, in the form of a definition clearly absent of the word lobbying. Bread classifies the way it seeks to influence policy as when, “[its] members send letters and emails, make phone calls, and visit their members of Congress about legislation that addresses hunger in the U.S. and around the world.”⁴²⁸

Although, the term is consistently absent as shown in the examples above, the definition of lobbying, nevertheless, is present in each case. This suggests CLOs’ general cognizance of the negative connotation the term carries in public opinion. Moreover, the emphasis on advocacy, coupled with the circumvention of the usage of the actual term ‘lobbying’, enables CLOs to clearly differentiate their activities from those of secular organizations whose lobbying is motivated primarily by self/group interests; and whose tactics are often viewed as questionable in terms of moral rectitude. This act of differentiation points to a perceived necessity on the part of CLOs to distinguish the importance of the strategy of lobbying as a means to promote policies in consonance with their Christian vision of the common good, as well as a just and moral society, from the general perceptions associated with the process of lobbying as an unethical industry. Accordingly, one can conclude that lobbying as a political praxis aimed at social, economic, and political transformation is a legitimate enterprise for Christians that should not be eschewed based on the fact that certain individuals or groups’ opprobriously employed the practice to their personal advantage.

Additionally, the amalgamation of the concept of advocacy with that of lobbying as the defined yet pragmatic means to achieve desirable legislative victories in alignment with espoused ecclesiastical principles, imparts within the political activity itself theological and spiritual significance. This means advocacy as a theological construct and spiritual practice transforms lobbying into more than a just a political exercise; it gives lobbying divine import. In the realm of political science this theoretical basis that assists in understanding the factors behind the lobbying practices of certain CLOs is not adequately communicated by employing either ‘quid pro quo

exchange process’ or ‘providing expert information’ theories alone. Furthermore, the theoretical position positing that CLOs engage in lobbying inspired by theological or spiritual motivations is largely absent in debates on the topic in the academic field of political science.

The ELCA’s explication on the significance of advocacy assists in the development of this theme. “We serve,” as this denominational body asserts, “in response to God’s love to meet human needs and protect creation. When we, as ELCA members, lift our voices together to influence policies that advance the common good, we further God’s work in our world.”⁴²⁹ For Bread, a similar theme emerges, as it is “God’s grace in Jesus Christ” that compels them to advocate “for a world without hunger.”⁴³⁰ In both cases, it is through advocacy—made manifest in their actions taken to influence Congress—from which a wellspring of Christian public piety emerges that avows and pursues the implementation of Christian social principles in the broader society. This factor reveals that in the context of CLOs’ political efforts, the purported reason for their advocacy is not grounded or arises primarily out of self-interest, as in the case of the secular groups mentioned in the foregoing chapters. This is also the case, as inferred, even when the advocacy work of CLOs directly benefits the self-interests of the individual or group that advocates. This is because, for CLOs, the principle and inspiration to lobby are not singularly derived from self-interest; instead, they originate from a profession of faith and a divine unction external to any single person or group, which guides them in their political efforts.

This is not to suggest lobbying activities conducted by CLOs are void of self-interest. Surely this is not the case, as is evident in specific historical examples previously examined—particularly those highlighting the founding of certain CLOs that were commissioned with the express intent of monitoring legislation that directly affected their church group. On the other hand, to suggest that all denominational policy interests are rooted solely in self-interest is to neglect the fact that certain denominational interests actually spring from rationalized theological or spiritual principles. As such, the origin of their inspiration as a divine source is comparable to the cases of those CLOs that advocate for a particular cause or concern, which they perceive extends from a divine mandate. The key point of emphasis here is that the conjoining of advocacy and lobbying, as the chosen political means to express one’s Christian faith, for Christian lobbyists, imparts theological and spiritual significance that extends beyond solely the motive of self-interest for them.

As shown in the realm of CLOs, the terms ‘advocacy’ and ‘lobbying’ are bound in a unique union. To summarize, the advocacy that inspires a great deal of CLOs’ lobbying work points to a divine mandate or source that compels such action by Christian advocates. Regardless of the underlying motivations for the activities CLOs undertake to influence Congress, those actions fall entirely within the field of lobbying.

CLOs: Social Justice and Christian Morality?

A fundamental characteristic of representative democracy is the free participation of the citizenry in electing politicians to public office who will best represent their interests in government. The basic and singular act of voting is the primary means a citizenry—as the sovereign political actor⁴³¹ within a given democratic state—expresses power and exerts influence over the nation-state that, in effect, ought to contribute to determining the course of government until the next election occurs. Furthermore, despite the diversity of opinion amongst a given constituency, the candidates elected by winning vote tallies clearly represent the general will of the majority. As such, the policies or principles espoused by a successful candidate prior to election constitute a sort of public mandate that ought to serve as a framework for decision-making and should be pursued once in office. This, of course, is the ideal. Besides this factor, however, in the United States’ form of representative democracy, the citizenry has the constitutional right to petition government. Consequently, the exercise of this right has resulted in the challenge and non-pursual of given public mandates. This is most evident in instances when varied lobbyists, representative of minority but powerful interests, secure legislation favorable to their specific interests as a result of the effectiveness of their lobbying, despite those interests being clearly oppositional to the general will and common good. Consequently, the mandates set forth by the citizenry in their collective participation in free and open elections—the clearest expression of the sovereignty’s universal will—are clearly undermined. This method of petitioning of government for such ends has become a societal norm in practice, and is commonly perceived as falling squarely within the statutory intent of the framers of the First Amendment. This is, however, a transgression of the First Amendment’s intrinsic meaning and purpose.

There are obvious historical examples where the undermining, terminating, or non-pursuit of the electorates’ mandates is essential in promoting and establishing

justice and the common good. The periods when Antebellum and Jim Crow policies of slavery and oppression were enforced are clear cases of such times. Therefore, the lobbying efforts set in motion to halt and destroy these policies and systems proved effective in achieving the intended purpose of the First Amendment of the Constitution, which provides, “the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”⁴³² Those petitions were in grievance of social injustices—though mandated by the majority of the citizenry—that violated the inherent rights of segments of the population, as well as the common good. This runs contrary to the example of petitioners, whose petitions are for exclusive social, economic or political advantage or privilege for their corresponding group.

Admittedly, the analysis above is a gross over-simplification of the United States’ brand of representative democracy with its extremely complex processes, and the possible methods by which influencing policy outcomes result in that context. Specifically, it clearly overlooks that the public mandates as expressed by the electorate are unlawful in all cases where the Constitution is violated. The various electoral processes established within the body politic, particularly on the federal level, are in fact based on an intricate fragmentation of the electorate which represents an innumerable quantity of ideas, opinions and interests reflected in the various mandates held by each member of Congress. Moreover, the shaping of any given candidate or elected official’s policy agendas is not done in a silo, nor is solely resultant of personal conviction. At any given moment, public officials are influenced by lobbyists who continually target, fund, and support potential candidates and politicians as a way of ensuring their interests remain on the docket of policy priorities. This list can undoubtedly be extended. The point of the foregoing illustration, however, is to briefly contrast the demonstrated and normalized misappropriation of the First Amendment, on the one hand, with the viable check to grievance, on the other—of which the latter’s implementation is designed to promote and infuse fairness and justice in American society. Correspondingly, in direct relation to CLOs’ aims, the achievement of the latter is the espoused objective of a number of these organizations, as they labor to realize a just and equitable United States of America for all people.

Accordingly, there are CLOs whose organizational missions communicate a solitary commitment to the actualization of justice in society, as they work toward the eradication of various social injustices. While there are other groups that lobby on a variety of policy issues in which the pursuit of justice is but one of many issues and

concerns. In both cases, nonetheless, these organizations aim to extricate from the nation-state policies and conditions that obstruct impartiality, while advocating for others that institute and safeguard justice as a fundamental right for all. Such organizations share a commonly held mission that inspires them to work toward the infusion of social justice throughout society.

However, what does the term ‘social justice’ actually mean to these CLOs? The evidence shows this term is frequently used, particularly amongst individuals and activists working toward societal transformation on the liberal order—in both secular and religious organizations. Yet the conceptualization of a tangible framework to achieve social justice, as an end, remains elusive. To further explicate, in a lecture entitled, “*Social Justice: Not What You Think It Is*,” Novak concisely details the origin of the concept social justice. He discloses, “The first known usage of the term is by an Italian priest, Luigi Taparelli D’Azeglio, who wrote a book about the need for recovering the ancient virtue of what had been called ‘general justice’ in Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, but in a new contemporary form. He gave it the term ‘social justice.’ The term was given prominence by Antonio Rosmini-Serbati in *La Costituzione Secondo la Giustizia Sociale* in 1848.”⁴³³ The historical background that underpinned the intellectual development of this concept is as follows: In an attempt to address the social inequities that accompanied Western civilization’s shift from a feudal society to that of a capitalistic society, Catholic scholars, like those mentioned, began to call the church’s attention to the necessity of addressing, with the hope of rectifying, the novel manifestations of societal injustices germane to their era. Novak goes on to reveal, however, “Taparelli wasn’t clear what he was looking for, but he was clear about the problems.”⁴³⁴ Even today, the difficulty of overcoming this hurdle of defining the essence of social justice in society remains elusive. In fact, many contemporary descriptions render the concept just as nebulous as it appeared during Taparelli’s time, if not more so; they are often obscure, without providing any conclusive qualifiers to distinguish social justice’s principal aim. “Theories of social justice,” writes Spragens, “are either hegemonic (defending a single determinate standard), skeptical (finding social justice to be radically indeterminate if not meaningless), or pluralistic (claiming that we can disqualify all but a handful of standards, but that we cannot definitively adjudicate among these).”⁴³⁵ As such, definitions and theories vary greatly depending upon the source. There is simply no uniformity in the explanation of social justice. Following are several examples for consideration.

Social justice is often defined as “the equal distribution of resources and opportunities, in which outside factors that categorize people are irrelevant.”⁴³⁶ This definition seems to allude, in part, to the creation of an economic system based on equal ownership, which could be interpreted as a form of socialism or communism. This position clearly argues social justice is best understood as a type of economic model. The Pachamama Alliance, a secular organization that advocates for the protection indigenous communities in Ecuador’s Amazon rainforest, offers the following description: “Social justice is the equal access to wealth, opportunities, and privileges within a society.”⁴³⁷ This organization extends the definition beyond economics to the social sphere. Additionally, the Center for Economic and Social Justice argues:

“Social justice is the virtue which guides us in creating those organized human interactions we call institutions. In turn, social institutions, when justly organized, provide us with access to what is good for the person, both individually and in our associations with others. Social justice also imposes on each of us a personal responsibility to collaborate with others, at whatever level of the “Common Good” in which we participate, to design and continually perfect our institutions as tools for personal and social development.”⁴³⁸

From this perspective, the achievement of social justice abides primarily in an institutional-centric developmental model, which will ultimately help facilitate social transformation. Next along the continuum, conservative think tank, the Heritage Foundation, purports: “Social justice is really the capacity to organize with others to accomplish ends that benefit the whole community. If people are to live free of state control, they must possess this new virtue of cooperation and association. This is one of the great skills of Americans and, ultimately, the best defense against statism.”⁴³⁹ Here, again, is a completely different take on the concept, which concludes the essence of social justice is the freedom of the public to pursue what it perceives most advantageous for the public good without the controls or regulations of big government.

Finally, there are other scholars that totally reject the term. They assert that social justice is an illogical expression that possesses an inherent yet pointless redundancy. Bonus makes this critique, arguing, “Justice is a matter of social conflict. In a one-person world, justice is pointless. It is only when people interact and their interests collide that justice enters the scene. In this sense, the very concept of ‘social’ justice is ill-defined: since justice is always a social issue, the attribute ‘social’ must take on special connotations if any meaning at all is to be given to the term ‘social justice.’”⁴⁴⁰ However, Bonus failed to consider that social justice takes on a specific

connotation, as does “criminal justice” or “environmental justice.” Nevertheless, there is a great amount of incongruity in defining the term and, in effect, it makes articulating a concise and broadly held vision of social justice problematic. Still, as elusive as finding a comprehensively agreed upon definition may be, in the case of certain CLOs that promulgate their commitment to social justice, these institutions have come to articulate their own vision of what the concept means. Sojourners provides a relevant example.

Historically, Sojourners is an individual membership-based CLO that has been in operation since the early 1970s. It frames its mission today in the following terms: “Sojourners is to articulate the biblical call to social justice, to inspire hope and build a movement to transform individuals, communities, the church, and the world.”⁴⁴¹ Furthermore, Sojourners was initially organized because, as Hall recounts: “A number of ‘young evangelicals’ began to criticize the old evangelical establishment, particularly for their lack of involvement in the civil rights and anti-war movements. What emerged was a group of reform-minded, sometimes radical, evangelicals who were determined to lead a movement that would return the Church to involvement in social change and social action.”⁴⁴² Consequently, the activism of the 1960s, in general, and the Civil Rights Movement, in particular, left an indelible mark on the minds of these young Christians. Ultimately, it inspired a certain introspective tendency that led to their rejection of the status quo socio-political expressions practiced by the form of evangelicalism prevalent in their day. As a result of a deep, abiding conviction that a new kind of evangelical socio-political engagement was necessary, Hall notes, “In 1971, an organization called The Sojourners was founded by Jim Wallis.”⁴⁴³ Since its founding, the mission of Sojourners has remained unwavering, expressly in its efforts “to articulate the biblical call to social justice” among evangelicals in particular.⁴⁴⁴

While the concept of social justice is, as evident, a central facet of Sojourners’ overall mission, the question remains: what does the organization understand the concept to mean? Specifically for this organization, and unlike the aforementioned sources, the concept of social justice is based on a biblical hermeneutic, which conveys a divine imperative centered on what in theological terms is characterized as Kingdom theology.⁴⁴⁵ To explain, for Sojourners, social justice results in society as a consequence of women and men being reconciled to Christ, and God’s kingdom, by the power of the Holy Spirit through the process of regeneration. As men and women are reconciled to the kingdom of God, what inherently follows is the continual

transformation of social relations and the institutions comprised of these agents. This is a divine consequence of a process of spiritual sanctification that inevitably leads them to advocate for and live lives dedicated to the demands of social justice as revealed in the teachings of Jesus Christ. Hall elaborates on this point, affirming for Sojourners that “The need for conversion and a personal identification with Jesus are prerequisites for social and political change.”⁴⁴⁶ Therefore a basic indicating factor or verifiable proof of the Kingdom of God’s reign in the hearts of individuals who have experienced spiritual conversion is observed in their socio-political engagement through advocacy, which inevitably seeks to transform policies and societal systems that are oppressive to the human mind, body and soul.

Jim Wallis, Sojourners’ president and founder, further expounds upon this theme of the Kingdom of God (expressly its function as the divine agent which inaugurates into human affairs a world order based on the reign of God). He writes, “Sojourners expressed the identity of God’s people as aliens who are citizens of another Kingdom, fully present in the world but committed to a different order, those who learn to ‘sing the Lord’s song in a strange land.’”⁴⁴⁷ In consequence, Wallis’ form of evangelicalism extends the definition of proselytization to that of calling souls not yet awakened to a spiritual journey that is resolutely committed to social justice; in the context of a world system not only in opposition, but completely foreign, to the Christian way of living. In the face of this dualistic reality, according to Wallis, all Christians are presented with two clear options, whether to dedicate oneself wholly to the kingdom of God or to the kingdoms of this world. In an article entitled, “Dangerous Religion: George W. Bush’s Theology of Empire,” Wallis cautions his readers, “Once there was Rome; now there is a new Rome... And once there were Christians who were loyal not to Rome but to the kingdom of God. To whom will the Christians be loyal today?”⁴⁴⁸ This was clearly a clarion call on Wallis’s part to evangelical Christians to apprehend that faithfulness to Christ innately renders one in conflict with oppressive political powers, and by wearing the mantle of social justice the fruitful evidence of a steadfast commitment to the kingdom of God is made known.

As stated earlier, Wallis and his cohorts re-embraced and promulgated this theological hermeneutic of social justice, in the context of an era when white evangelical voices were silent on blaring injustices in American society. Therefore, as Hall informs, “Wallis likened the movement to a revival. He points out that evangelical Christians of the past have led many movements for social change. The abolitionist

movement ‘had its roots deep in revivalist soil’ (Wallis, 1983:189). The biblical demands for social justice were close to the hearts of the 19th century evangelicals.”⁴⁴⁹ Hence, in an effort to recover this tradition, Sojourners was founded and has labored for nearly a half century for what they describe as, “a future in which Christians put their faith into action in the passionate pursuit of social justice, peace, and environmental stewardship, working in partnership with people of other perspectives, for the common good of communities, families and individuals... [And] articulate that vision, convene and mobilize constituencies, and build alliances for effective advocacy.”⁴⁵⁰

The biblical call to social justice translates into concrete legislative priority areas for Sojourners—namely, “poverty and budget, peace and non-violence, racial justice, immigration, and women and girls.”⁴⁵¹ While this is certainly not a comprehensive list, it provides clear insight into what social issues are germane to Sojourner’s understanding of a biblical call to social justice. This set of concerns also reflects the policy areas that are commonly held by other CLOs within this category. To further explore, it is evident from Sojourners’ policy priorities that the concept of God’s preferential option of the poor⁴⁵² in some clear aspects harmonizes with its biblical hermeneutic of social justice. Dault clarifies the meaning of this theological expression: “the option for the poor referred especially to a trend throughout biblical texts, where there is a demonstrable preference given to powerless individuals who live on the margins of society.”⁴⁵³ A review of the policies Sojourners advocates for in relation to poverty and budget, racial justice, immigration, and women and girls discloses a distinct concern for these oft-times marginalized members of society. This compassion is clearly reflected in its attempt to secure favorable legislation that provides socio-economic opportunity and equality for such affected persons.

Specifically regarding issues of poverty and budget, Sojourners and other CLOs that fit this profile view the national budget as an ethical document that can serve as a litmus test for the moral integrity of the nation. In their view, the division of public expenditures communicates what is most (and least) important to the body politic as a whole; thus, analysis of such data conveys the fundamental character of the nation. In other words, it is through a keen examination of how federal dollars are appropriated and spent that a clear picture of national priorities comes into focus. This is where moral failings are identified, specifically in cases where allocations that assist the most vulnerable members of society fall short of meeting basic needs. In order to rectify such

identifiable shortcomings, the national budgeting process serves as a legislative vehicle for CLOs to create, influence, strengthen, and secure governmental programs that safeguard the interest of poor and marginalized groups. CLOs, therefore, lobby for legislation that ensures favorable policies advantageous to these segments of the population's socio-economic well-being. In doing so, such groups whose voices are often unheard and whose interests go unnoticed are, instead, supported and advocated for, with the hope that their concerns will be raised on the national priority list. This is CLOs' way of acting to strengthen the moral integrity of the nation. For it is their deepest held religious conviction that it is morally right to include within the budget sufficient resources to assist the poor, the oppressed, the marginalized, and the alien. As such, Sojourners promulgates that it "seeks to lift up the voices of those who aren't being heard, to deconstruct the misinformation that surrounds the budget process, and to hold leaders accountable for their actions that affect the 'least of these.'"⁴⁵⁴ A similar motif is evident surrounding their advocacy on racial justice. Accordingly, Sojourners reports its work aims "to expose the lies that fuel racism, privilege, and a broken criminal justice system."⁴⁵⁵ What is well-defined here is that in each of these cases, the call to biblical social justice in Sojourners' opinion entails working to transform conditions that negatively impact the marginalized, disenfranchised, and oppressed. This remains central to Sojourners' lobbying efforts.

It is important to highlight that each of these issue areas are directly connected to a theological underpinning that has been thoughtfully articulated by Sojourners' leadership. Precisely for each, there exists a Christological basis, which gives particular significance to the application of Jesus Christ's teaching in the social, economic, and political realms. Wallis, in his celebrated work entitled, *God's Politics*, makes this point unequivocally clear as he emphasizes each issue area's Christological foundation, as well as the importance of their full embrace in praxis by followers of Christ. He admonishes,

"It's time to assert and reclaim the gospel faith—especially in our public life. When we do, we discover that faith challenges the powers that be to do justice for the poor, instead of preaching a 'prosperity gospel' and supporting politicians who further enrich the wealthy. We remember that faith hates violence and tries to reduce it and exerts a fundamental presumption against war, instead of justifying it in God's name. We see that faith creates community from racial, class, and gender divisions and prefers international community over nationalist religion, and we see that 'God bless America' is found nowhere in the Bible."⁴⁵⁶

He goes on to support his claims by employing scriptural references found in the Gospels:

“Jesus said, ‘Blessed are the poor,’ and opened up his own ministry by proclaiming, ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor’ (which was a direct biblical reference to the Jubilee Year in the Hebrew Scriptures where, periodically, the debts of the poor were cancelled, slaves were set free, and land was redistributed for the sake of equity). People such as U2’s lead singer, Bono, see the contemporary relevance of such Scripture for issues such as global poverty and the HIV/AIDS pandemic in Africa, and so do many of his young fans—so why don’t others see it. In Matthew’s twenty-fifth chapter, Jesus speaks of the hungry, the homeless, the stranger, prisoners, and the sick and promises he will challenge all his followers on the judgment day with these words, “As you have done to the least of these, you have done to me.”⁴⁵⁷

What is particularly fascinating is the underlying assumption that advocacy is the means to achieve, in all the stated areas, the criteria of Christian social action as detailed by the Gospel writers in the scriptural passages Wallis quotes. The key point for Wallis here is that these passages are certainly not to the exclusion of advocacy, which has, arguably, proven less appealing to certain evangelicals who may more readily engage in charitable acts. Furthermore, the issues agenda formulated by Sojourners is primarily based on its interpretation of the social teachings espoused by Jesus Christ in the Gospels. Accordingly, this theological vantage point serves as rubric through which social injustices are identified, while simultaneously providing a Christological approach essential to devising policy solutions to address those injustices based on what Sojourners holds to be rooted in a biblical call to social justice.⁴⁵⁸

Certainly, Sojourners is representative of a larger number of CLOs that are in pursuit of social justice as they define it biblically. It is, however, essential to clarify CLOs representing this type of designation may or may not describe their work as being within the realm of social justice. This description is used here as a means to identify a particular commonality amongst a variant group of CLOs that advocate for policies that foster social conditions that enable and support the physical, psychological, and material well-being of all members of society in general, as well as the poor, oppressed, and marginalized, in particular. This is not to the infringement of any other person or group, except for the necessity of securing the common good, so that each person’s potential can develop without the obstruction of social, economic, or political realities

or contrivances that may violate one's right to prosper. Policies advocated for by the CLOs in this categorization, in general, reflect the tenor of Sojourners as outlined above; albeit, the theological rationalizations that support this classification's advocacy may slightly differ amongst each group.

Bread is another example of an individual membership-based social justice-oriented CLO, which demands our consideration here briefly. Bread does not necessarily self-identify, as unequivocally as Sojourners does, as a social justice organization. Nevertheless, its approach to advocacy, which seeks to rectify a broadly recognized social injustice, positively classifies the organization in this category. Likewise, Bread's members and activists readily utilize the term to describe the intent and purpose of their advocacy, albeit, with arguably less frequency than other organizations' official publications. As communicated in an article entitled, "Washington gathering empowers a new generation for social justice," Watson uses the term in her title as she reports on a Pan-African women's gathering hosted by Bread, where women of various African heritages gathered to speak out against "a social injustice: poverty and hunger."⁴⁵⁹ The concept is clearly embraced here. Furthermore, the apt conclusion is, even when the term 'social justice' is not used but one declares poverty and hunger a social injustice, this intrinsically implies that the advocacy necessary to eradicate it entails the work of pursuing social justice. This is manifestly at the very heart of Bread's mission, being a social justice-oriented CLO whose emphasis is to end hunger and poverty domestically and internationally. In fact, this is the summation of all its organizational activities, which are determined in light of solely achieving that designated end. In other words, the issues adopted, policies pursued, and grass roots and direct lobbying strategies engaged are viewed through the prism of how the aggregation of these activities will effect eliminating these twin debilitating social conditions globally. Bread's mission, advocacy, lobbying strategies, and theological underpinnings will be analyzed in depth in later chapters. At this point, it is sufficient to state that Bread is another suitable illustration of a CLO whose mission and activities squarely classifies them as being social justice-oriented, despite the ways in which the organization may label itself.

As highlighted, Bread and Sojourners are two examples, out of many other unspecified CLOs, that can be classified as being social justice-oriented. They are specifically recognized for their lobbying activities around legislating a moral framework that holds individuals and systems of power accountable for supporting poor

and marginalized members of society. Along the continuum of CLOs whose legislative agendas can be distinctly categorized, there are those organizations that seek to infuse within the body politic biblically interpreted moral principles that mandate citizens follow a personal code of morality, categorized as “traditional family values.” The Family Research Council (FRC) is a primary example of this type of CLO, that describes its organizational presence in Washington, D.C., as “a sign of our determination to preserve and advance the heritage of religious belief and family values handed down from generation to generation.”⁴⁶⁰ The FRC would also fall under the category of an individual membership-based CLO.

In fact, the FRC is the former lobbying arm of Focus on the Family, a conservative evangelical movement that defines itself as “a global Christian ministry dedicated to helping families thrive.”⁴⁶¹ Furthermore, the ministry claims its *raison d’être* is to “provide help and resources for couples to build healthy marriages that reflect God’s design, and for parents to raise their children according to morals and values grounded in biblical principles.”⁴⁶² It is important to note, these organizations’ method of addressing social concerns and injustices is through the promotion of family values. To assist in realizing this objective within the public square, in 1983 FRC was established under the direction of Dr. James Dobson, founder and chairman emeritus of Focus on the Family. The origin of FRC can be traced back three years earlier.⁴⁶³ At the behest of the Carter administration, clergypersons gathered in Washington, D.C., to consider public policies that directly affected families.⁴⁶⁴ At this meeting, Dr. Dobson, alongside a group of likeminded ecclesiastical leaders, decided it was necessary to initiate the establishment of the FRC as a way, as its official communication reports, “to counter the credentialed voices arrayed against life and family with equally capable men and women of faith.”⁴⁶⁵ Consequently, by 1983, FRC was functioning as a full-fledge CLO in Washington, D.C., representing the public policy interests of Focus on the Family. In 1992, however, FCR split from Focus on the Family as a “strategic decision that afforded it greater scope.”⁴⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Focus on the Family maintained its influence with Dr. Dobson, alongside other Focus on the Family leadership, serving on the board of directors of the newly independent organization.⁴⁶⁷

Today, the FRC articulates its mission is “to advance faith, family, and freedom in public policy and the culture from a Christian worldview.”⁴⁶⁸ In terms of a concrete issues agenda that achieves this mandate, FCR divides its work into three distinct policy areas: “Life, Marriage & Family, and Religious Liberty.”⁴⁶⁹ Specifically, under the

category 'Life,' the specific policies considered reflect the following themes: "abortion, euthanasia/end of life issues, stem cells and biotechnology, conscience protection, and women's health."⁴⁷⁰ FRC lobbies for policies in each of these groupings that are in alignment with its pro-life political perspective, and against any that are pro-choice in nature. "As God is the Author of life," FRC argues, "Family Research Council recognizes and respects the inherent dignity of every human life from conception (whether by natural or artificial means) until death. FRC desires to help build a culture of life, holding that all human life is a gift to be treasured. The life of every human being is an intrinsic good, not something whose value is conditional upon its usefulness to others or to the state."⁴⁷¹ For this reason policies supporting abortion, euthanasia, and stem cell research are purposefully contested by FRC: "Neither scientific progress nor the desire to help others can justify the sacrifice of any human being's life or inherent dignity. Every human being, born or unborn, deserves the equal protection of the law."⁴⁷²

Next, under the category of 'Family & Marriage,' FRC's lobbying efforts cover "family structure, family economics, parental rights, human sexuality, education, abstinence and sexual health, homosexuality, and pornography."⁴⁷³ Central to all policies tucked in the varied areas under this category is FRC's fundamental definition of marriage as being solely between a man and a woman. As such, FRC is inexorably opposed to any policy that seeks to define marriage in any terms other than the stated. Accordingly, FRC in no uncertain terms publicizes that it "champions marriage and family as the foundation of civilization, the seedbed of virtue, and the wellspring of society. Properly understood, 'families' are formed only by ties of blood, marriage, or adoption, and 'marriage' is a union of one man and one woman."⁴⁷⁴ Furthermore, specifically in regards to policies supporting the authorization of same-sex marriage, FRC argues, "Attempts to join two men or two women in 'marriage' constitute a radical redefinition and falsification of the institution, and FRC supports state and federal constitutional amendments to prevent such redefinition by courts or legislatures."⁴⁷⁵ Its support for the stated legislative measures obviously places FRC in an antagonistic position towards any relevant policies supportive of same-sex marriage. It should be no surprise, furthermore, that policies that support LGBTQ adoption are also spurned and opposed. Overall, FRC views all family structures beyond those that consists of a husband and wife as a deviation, and therefore less than archetypal for childrearing. Specifically, FRC advocates that it "believes, and social science has now clearly

demonstrated, that children do best when raised by their own biological mother and father who are committed to one another in a lifelong marriage.”⁴⁷⁶

Furthermore, sexual intercourse outside of the institution of marriage as defined above is also deprecated by FRC: “FRC believes the context for the full expression of human sexuality is within the bonds of marriage between one man and one woman.”⁴⁷⁷ It concludes, “Upholding this standard of sexual behavior would help to reverse many of the destructive aspects of the sexual revolution, including sexually transmitted disease rates of epidemic proportion, high out-of-wedlock birth rates, adultery, and homosexuality.”⁴⁷⁸ This position translates, on the one hand, into public policies that support “abstinence-until-marriage,” and asserts on the other hand, “that contraceptive-based or comprehensive sex education is destructive, providing mixed risk messaging and an overly narrow focus on physical health alone.”⁴⁷⁹ In other words, the position advanced here stresses that sexual relations outside the context of marriage as defined is not only averse to FRC’s theological understanding of God’s original design and primary purpose of sexual intercourse, which is the divinely sanctioned reproductive method to propagate the human species; it results in the fueling of social and public health disorders that are precarious to the human condition. As intimated, FRC utilizes an array of medical and social scientific data to buttress their position.

Lastly, in the category of “Family & Marriage,” pornography is an additional subdivision meriting brief consideration. Unequivocally, and without astonishment, pornography is also viewed by FRC as destructive to the social fabric of American life. The organization asserts, “Pornography has spread like a plague in our nation. It has moved from the margins of our culture to the mainstream, attacking marriages, families, and communities. Worst of all, it has stolen a time of innocence from our children.”⁴⁸⁰ Specifically, in terms of FRC’s policy approach in addressing this issue, its lobbying efforts predominantly focus on legislation that safeguards children from the pornography industry and its wider influence. “Family Research Council calls for the vigorous enforcement of all existing laws against child pornography and obscenity,”⁴⁸¹ the organization avers. Accordingly, the challenges associated with formulating effective policies that counteract and protect children from gaining access to pornographic material on the Internet do not go unnoticed or ignored by FRC. On the one hand, FRC readily admits, “We do not have adequate laws to protect children from this kind of material online.” On the other hand, however, FRC affirms its determination “to work toward stronger laws to protect children.”⁴⁸²

Furthermore, what is noteworthy is FRC's acknowledgement of the constitutionality of certain classifications of pornography. This recognition, however, does not imply FRC's legislative impartiality to its continuance. For this CLO, the psychological and spiritual threat pornography poses to children and families is immediate and must be prevented by all legal means. Hence, to achieve that specific end, FRC argues, "Even the pornography that enjoys constitutional protection as 'free speech' can be regulated."⁴⁸³ As such, FRC continually seeks creative ways of regulating pornographic consumption, particularly by minors.

Briefly, FRC's aforementioned third legislative area of focus is religious liberty. Vitally important to FRC is the strict observation and protection of the First Amendment, which ensures the constitutional right to religious freedom and its unimpeded expression. It is through the petitioning of government that a key function of FRC's mission is derived and achieved. Clearly, this statutory effect allows the organization to support legislation it perceives will impact the moral character of the nation. FRC asserts, "Citizens, churches, private organizations, and public officials have every right to proclaim their faith in public settings and to bring their religiously-informed moral values to bear in election campaigns and public policy decisions."⁴⁸⁴ Actually, FRC, and, for that matter, CLOs of various political predilections, understand religious liberty as a constitutional right that conjoins the church and state in a unique bond, effectively affording religious bodies the legal right to engage in influencing the body politic as constituencies of concerned citizens. FRC makes this point exceedingly clear: "The Founders' intention in this was clear—that Congress should not name an official national church or denomination. However, they did not intend a 'wall of separation' between all expressions of faith in God and all aspects of public life."⁴⁸⁵ Accordingly, in FRC's opinion, Jefferson's enduring quote to the Danbury Baptists of Connecticut is often misappropriated to infer church groups' complete withdrawal from politics. Inversely, FRC concludes its accurate meaning to, in fact, convey the principle that an un-scalable wall should perpetually exist that averts autocratic control over government by a single religious body. However, religious groups' varied opinions and political activities focused on shaping public policy are legitimate expressions and are not violations of the concept of separation between church and state. Furthermore, in FRC's estimation, this is further substantiated in the First Amendment, that rightfully establishes the civic privilege of citizens', including religious bodies', free expression of opinions to influence governmental policies.

Reflecting on FRC's three distinct policy areas investigated above and their corresponding subdivisions, there is an overarching theme that emerges: human sexuality, which encompasses human reproduction. This is evident in the pro-life and anti-abortion legislation FRC pursues; its lobbying work on the defense of family or of marriage as a union 'solely between a man and woman' points to this theme; the anti-pornography policies clearly fall within this field; and even its work on religious liberty focuses partly on a constitutional right to speak out against sexual behaviors at odds with its religious convictions. For example, "The issue of religious liberty," FRC emphasizes, "is everywhere in the news and current events. The term often emerges alongside hot-button issues like abortion and sexual identity."⁴⁸⁶ In FRC's case, there is a direct connection between lobbying on the range of human sexuality policies describe above, and the preservation of its constitutional right to do so. Specifically, nine sections out of the fourteen total issue areas on which FCR lobbies relate directly to human sexuality.⁴⁸⁷ Three relate indirectly—"parental rights," "education," and, as already stated, "religiously liberty."⁴⁸⁸ Only the remaining two—"family economics" and "euthanasia/end of life issues"—have no immediate connection to the predominate theme of human sexuality.⁴⁸⁹

This conspicuous thematic trend is not unique to FRC's lobbying activities as a CLO within this type of categorization. Others in this category concentrate a substantial amount of their lobbying efforts on policies related to human sexuality; although framed in terms of family values, upon review one discovers their public policy positions are closely align to that of those of the FRC. Namely, Concerned Women for America (CWA), another individual membership-based CLO, shares a similar issues agenda. "Sanctity of Life," "Defense of Family," "Sexual Exploitation," "Education," and "Religious Liberty" are all policy areas engaged by CWA,⁴⁹⁰ and despite slight differences in headings, the policies within each of the related designations essentially mirror those of FRC. Surely, there are certain focus areas between the two organizations that are dissimilar; as is the case for likeminded social justice-oriented CLOs as observed. The key point, nonetheless, is that a substantial proportion of the lobbying work by CLOs concerned with traditional family values is exerted to achieve policies that impact human sexuality broadly.

This distinct focus reveals the enormous weight of significance their theologically sanctioned interpretation of human sexuality and reproduction carries within their religious communities. It is clearly a principal teaching, among a range of

teachings espoused by these groups, that has gained preeminence and articulates what is a most important identifier for them as proper Christian behavior. Furthermore, its significance is so critical that CLOs of this type are convinced it is not just for their religious group to adopt these practices; it is beneficial for all of society. Thus, they have concluded, it should be legislatively mandated. As a result, their lobbying efforts are focused on securing legislative victories that result in the inculcating within the general population a sexual behavioral norm and reproductive design based on a moral standard derived from their religious heritage.

In terms of the specific theological formulations used to inspire their work, “biblical” and “Judeo-Christian” are ubiquitous terms regularly employed by these CLOs to articulate a correlation between their faith perspective and the targeted public policies they pursue. These terms are often used in these organizations’ central communiqués, such as their vision and mission statements, that disclose the core objectives of the activities in question. They are also freely utilized in a range of articles and papers that provide theological rationales in support of any particular policy position. For example, Focus on the Family, whose historical ties with FRC are stated above, asserts its “primary reason for existence is to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ through a practical outreach to homes, we have firm beliefs about both the Christian faith and the importance of the family. This ministry is therefore based upon six guiding philosophies that... are drawn from the wisdom of the Bible and the Judeo-Christian ethic, rather than from the humanistic notions of today's theorists.”⁴⁹¹ Furthermore, in an article published by FRC entitled, “The Bible Teaching on Marriage and Family,” Köstenberger seeks to answer the questions, “What is marriage, biblically defined? And what is the biblical definition of a family?”⁴⁹² Here, the term ‘biblical’ is employed to provide the authoritative basis on which the policies regarding marriage are derived.

Correspondingly, CWA’s mission statement declares, “Concerned Women for America protects and promotes Biblical values and Constitutional principles through prayer, education, and advocacy.”⁴⁹³ Additionally in describing the organization’s objectives, CWA declares its principal mission is to “bring Biblical principles into all levels of public policy.”⁴⁹⁴ Moreover, CWA publicizes that its Institute, “Through sound research and education...will stand strong in defense of the family, Judeo-Christian values and those conservative principles that build responsible citizens and cultivate strong families, communities and nations.”⁴⁹⁵ In each of the foregoing examples, the focus theologically for FRC and CWA is squarely centered on this

concept of biblical values or ideals derived from a Judeo-Christian perspective. Clearly, these terms are used to give credence to their work and the public policy positions adopted. Yet, what exactly are the theological constructs behind these terms and their significance for these organizations?

Exploring the questions at hand, the resultant Judeo-Christian perspective, which is conversely a product of their biblical hermeneutic, is derived primarily from the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament Epistles. Commencing with the archetypal family structure that CLOs of this type firmly embrace and promote, such a model is taken from the book of Genesis, specifically the account as detailed in the Garden of Eden in the second and third chapters. Köstenberger provides keen insight into their theological underpinnings that are foundational to these CLOs' concept of original family design. He writes,

“In the book of Genesis, we read that God in the beginning created first a man (Adam) to exercise dominion over his creation and subsequently a woman (Eve) as the man's ‘suitable helper’ (Genesis 2:18, 20). Then, the inspired writer remarks, ‘Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh’ (Genesis 2:24 ESV). This verse sets forth the biblical pattern as it was instituted by God at the beginning: one man is united to one woman in matrimony, and the two form one new natural family. In this regard, ‘become one flesh’ not only refers to the establishment of one new family but also to the husband and wife's sexual union leading to the procreation of offspring. This, in turn, is in keeping with God's original command to the first human couple to ‘be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion’ over all of creation (Genesis 1:28).”⁴⁹⁶

The story of Adam and Eve as quoted, and in the manner interpreted, by Köstenberger reveals the core theological construct by which FRC, CWA and other likeminded CLOs of this type frame their work; it is what they seek to emulate on an individual and group level; and it is what ultimately stirs them to codify into law their sanctioned design for family and human sexuality, as a general mandate within society. For them, the story of Adam and Eve points to the original intent of human partnership or wedlock as being a life-long covenant solely between two persons of the opposite sex, with sexual intercourse being relegated only to the union of the two for the primary purpose of reproduction. As aforementioned, they consider any form of human sexuality outside of that familial context a deviation from God's original intent.

Accordingly, they argue all resultant sexual deviation is pursuant to and was effected by the fall of humanity. Köstenberger sheds light on this position: “Knowing the divine ideal for marriage, and aware that marriage and the family are divine

institutions, we are now able to move from God's creation of man and woman and his institution of marriage to the Fall of humanity and its negative consequences on the marriage relationship. As a study of biblical history shows, humanity's rebellion against the Creator's purposes led to at least the following six negative consequences: (1) polygamy; (2) divorce; (3) adultery; (4) homosexuality; (5) sterility; and (6) gender role confusion.”⁴⁹⁷ Consequently, with the unfolding of *Heilsgeschichte*, Köstenberger articulates that a central salvific effect of the Christ event is the renewal of the institution of marriage as based on the Genesis model of family and human sexuality, which is a manifestation of God’s eternal intent. Köstenberger adds,

“The New Testament teaches that the restoration of God's original design for marriage in Christ is part of God's realignment of all things under Christ's authority and lordship. In the book of Ephesians, we read that it is God's purpose ‘to bring all things in heaven and on earth together under one head, even Christ’ (Ephesians 1:10, NIV). Thus marriage is not an end in itself but part of God's end-time restoration of all things in the person of Jesus Christ. Part of this restoration is that all evil powers are brought under control and are submitted to the supreme authority of Christ (Ephesians 1:21-22). Later on in the same letter, Paul addresses the subject of marriage in general, and marital roles in particular, within the larger context of believers needing to be filled with the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 5:18).”⁴⁹⁸

Hence, marriage in its original design serves as an eschatological metaphor illustrative of the union between Jesus Christ and the Church. At the same time, marriage, as stated in practical terms, is a union whose familial expression is not only reflective of Christ’s redemptive work, it is an essential manifestation and vehicle of God’s love between individuals in a fallen world. This exact theological formulation is at the very center of these CLOs’ doctrinal underpinning that informs and inspires their lobbying activities.

In conclusion, both social justice and family values-oriented CLOs seek to infuse within society theological ideals and principles rooted in their deepest held convictions of the Christian faith. Their political aspirations are aimed at creating an ideal society in light of their respective hermeneutical outcomes, and therefore result in a Christian ethic that labors in support of or opposition to policies that impact the socio-political behavioral patterns within the nation that directly regard such themes. Moreover, it is important to mention that there are several organizations, like the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, a church-based CLO, that have embraced both social justice and family values policies in their lobbying work. These two categories are certainly not mutually exclusive, although, as shown, certain CLOs focus on one

and not the other. Once again, however, in the specific case of social-justice-oriented CLOs, the articulated aim is to promote justice, while fighting against oppressive policies that harm the most marginalized members of society. Alternatively, family values-oriented CLOs articulate their missions as promoting a biblical or Judeo-Christian worldview to legislatively achieve their sanctioned designs of family, and particularly, human sexuality. In a pluralistic democratic context like the United States of America, however, multiple questions arise that demand attention as it relates to the legality of these endeavors.

The defined purpose and intent of the U.S. government as articulated in the preamble of the Constitution is to “establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity...”⁴⁹⁹ Such being the case, social-justice oriented CLOs’ work for justice by way of legislation that promotes fairness, and their advocacy to protect marginalized members of society, not only seeks to achieve particularly espoused Christian convictions; their work essentially aligns with the basic premise of government being the legitimate agent in society that dispenses justice and promotes the wellbeing of all.

Regarding family value-oriented CLOs, several weighty questions arise in relation to the legal implications of their efforts. First, is it a violation of individual liberty, and possibly the principle of the separation of church and state, to legislate an archetype of marriage and human sexuality in the context of a pluralistic America? Secondly, do forms of legislated sexual morality promote social justice or benefit the common good? In other words, is there a connection between social justice and human sexuality? In terms of the latter question, clearly legislation against child pornography, and children’s access to pornographic material, are issues of social justice and promotes the common good. This is, undoubtedly, a prime example of a direct connection between human sexuality and the need for legislation to ensure social justice.

In relation to the first question, as an example, the issue of promoting policies against same-sex marriage by these CLOs forces upon society a pattern of marriage and sexuality these CLOs perceive as right. The enigma rests in the fact that CLOs of this type have the liberty to embrace and promulgate a form of marriage and sexuality that they believe is God’s original intent for humanity; and that restricting their ability to do so violates their religious liberty. In other words, the liberty to express their opinions on marriage and live out marital relations as they see fit is a sacred and inviolable right

that they enjoy as U.S. citizens, which they lobby to protect. Conversely, through the powers of government, they seek to restrict the liberty of others who desire to live in marital unions that conflict with the vision of marriage these CLOs promote. The religious groups that uphold God's "original design" for marriage, on the one side, and the proponents of same-sex marriage, on the other, are granted equal protection of the Constitution to liberty and justice as a sacred right. The question emerges, would imposing a monopolistic view of marriage by way of government lead to an infringement upon liberty and justice for all?

The Historical Emergence of CLOs

Historical records show that individual membership-based organizations and coalitions focused on single issues were among some of the first Christian groups to establish permanent lobbying offices in Washington, D.C. These ecumenical political organizations' ability to garner support from various Christian groups was directly linked to their determination to maintain a keen focus on a particular public policy issue without deviation. History substantiates those singular political issues resonated so soundly among large and diverse ecclesiastical bodies that it united them. Furthermore, these political issues proved to be more potent than any division that may have been caused by the plethora of theological distinctions each religious body held. Of course, behind any one socio-political issue stood theological rationales held by each ecclesiastical group that justified their support of the respective initiative. While this certainly does not mean that each group held the exact theological formulations, the varied theological underpinnings converged squarely in support of a policy issue which congealed and propelled them into collective political action. Unequivocally, the struggle to achieve Prohibition had this unique affect on many Christian groups, which led to the establishment of arguably one of the most effective CLOs of that or any era.

"Toward the end of the 19th century," Hertzke writes, "as the movement against consumption of alcohol gained strength in the U.S., several temperance organizations with ties to religious groups established Washington offices, including the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in 1895 and the Anti-Saloon League of America in 1899. The League's Washington office was directly across from the U.S. Capitol."⁵⁰⁰ The Anti-Saloon League, in particular, proved to be a well-organized and formidable political organization, which, from its inception, "was founded for action."⁵⁰¹

Harvey Graeme Furbay, Field Secretary of the League, defined its mission in no uncertain terms in an article published by the League in 1903. Furbay wrote, “The object of the League is the extermination of the saloon. It seeks to repeal laws favoring the existence of the saloon and the enactment of laws contributory to its abolishment.”⁵⁰² A combined grass roots and direct lobby strategy is detailed by Furbay as the primary means to achieve the organization’s stated objective. Nonpartisanship was also a guiding principle. “The methods of the League are political, but not partisan,” Furbay insisted.

Describing the composition and lobbying impact of the Anti-Saloon membership, Ebersole also discloses,

“Although temperance societies in and outside of the churches coöperated, the churches gave to the organization its strength. At first, the church’s tradition of non-intervention in politics produced doubts and resistance, but the hope of immediate reform was too great and the churches rallied to the cause. The Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists were notably strong in their support. It is estimated that the average number of affiliated churches throughout the United States between 1911 and 1925 was 30,000. ‘The movement was dependent upon the church, first of all, for financial support. It was also dependent upon the church for the necessary influence and power to turn the tide along non-partisan lines in the election of members of the legislatures favorable to temperance legislation and in the election, as well, of public officials who would enforce the law.’ Confronted with the charge that it was a political machine, the League answered, ‘The church is a machine and the league is a machine within a machine.’”⁵⁰³

The Anti-Saloon League was a disciplined political organization whose basis of support, as expressed above, rested firmly upon the lobbying activities of the ecumenical Christian group that comprised its membership base. The members of this alliance were willing to exert their influence in multiple ways: through financial support contributed to the League; direct lobbying on Capitol Hill to influence Congressional action; or offering, withdrawing, or denying electoral support to candidates based on their support of temperance legislation.

Additionally, the League was highly effective in orchestrating national educational campaigns that sought to sway public opinion in their favor.⁵⁰⁴ At the time, the League utilized written literature as the primary means of communication to disseminate their pro-temperance message. In fact, “To turn out enough literature to reach a large proportion of the voters, the League established its own publishing plant, the American Issue Publishing Company, at Westerville, Ohio, in 1909. By 1912, eight presses were printing more than forty tons of temperance literature each month,

including thirty-one state editions of the *American Issue*, with a total monthly circulation of more than 500,000.”⁵⁰⁵ Alongside the temperance literature produced directly by the League, there were “enormous quantities of temperance literature... published by individual members or friends of the league.”⁵⁰⁶

Furthermore, League’s tactics serve, to this day, as a model-type historical example of the intricacy of strategic thinking essential to successfully moving legislation on Capitol Hill for lobbyist in general and CLOs in particular. The following quote details the intricacy of their approach to lobbying:

“The League’s lobbyists were master strategists in their field. That no politician studied the process by which laws are made more carefully than they, is evidenced by the ten rules for effective lobbying set forth by Wayne B. Wheeler after fifteen years of experience.

1. The League should make every effort to see that the committees to which temperance legislation is referred are friendly. It is best to have a regular committee, since a special committee may be packed hostilely.
2. The bill should be introduced early in session. During the closing days each member has some pet measure and it is harder to get a fair consideration. The bill should be introduced first in the house... the senate being more conservative.
3. The introducer should be an able representative, with few enemies, one skilled in the procedural mysteries, who knows the bill from A to Z.
4. The bill should not be extreme. Do not be ‘whole hog or none.’
5. Hearings should be promptly held and well attended by representative people from the entire state, and from different walks of life.
6. Temperance bills should, if possible, be made special order at least ten days after they are reported.
7. As for the liquor lobby ‘all that is needed is to throw light in upon them and let the legislature and the people know what they are doing.’
8. The league should take no official stand on other measures.
9. ‘Petition in boots’ and letters and telegrams from constituents are often a determining factor.
10. The day of the third reading is the day of crisis. Advocates from all parties should speak for the bill to shut off the cry that it is a partisan measure. The galleries should be crowded with spectators, but demonstrations against the opponent of the bill should be discouraged. A yea and nay vote should be demanded on each important question. Effort should be made to prevent amendments. An amended bill means a conference committee and conference committees are dangerous, unless the leaders of the houses are temperance men.”⁵⁰⁷

This intricate approach to engaging and manipulating the legislative process to the League’s advantage—as articulated here by its chief lobbyist of that era—underscores a political savviness emphasized even today as vital for successful legislative campaigns. What is also important to note is that the organizational leadership of this

CLO—one of the earliest established—realized at that juncture in history that lobbying activities on Capitol Hill were to be approached scientifically by not only understanding the political and procedural aspects of the national legislature, but also the human, psychological, and social dimensions that factor into moving legislators to act affirmatively. The Anti-Saloon League is a standard-bearer for all CLOs that follow in terms of its organizational tactics and ability to effectively get things done legislatively.

In addition to these ecumenical membership-based CLOs, the Roman Catholic Church is also recognized as founding one of the earliest established CLOs of the denominational or church-based type in Washington, D.C. This particular CLO's initial emphasis was on initiatives pertaining to the U.S. government's social policy in relation to the Native American population. "During the administration of President Ulysses S. Grant the federal government contracted with church organizations to run schools, orphanages and other social programs for Native Americans. A number of denominations participated in the program, including the Roman Catholic Church, which established the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions in 1881 to coordinate the sizeable grants it received," Hertzke reveals.⁵⁰⁸ What he does not share is that this governmental policy was the outcome of prior lobbying efforts first initiated by Protestant church groups, and then followed-up by the Roman Catholic Church, that specifically established an office in Washington, D.C., to ensure they received a portion of the grant funding designated for religious bodies that were already working amongst the Native American population. Thus, Protestant and Catholic efforts together assisted in uniting the U.S. government with denominational bodies in a cooperative manner to address social conditions amongst the Native American population.

In summarizing the events that led up to this policy, Native Americans had suffered as victims of grave injustices often without advocates or defense as a result of the U.S. government's expansionist policies. Even ostentatious policies directed toward the social uplift of the Native American population—which was, at this historical juncture, consigned to reservations—resulted in greater exploitation by political appointees that were charged to provide certain socio-economic supports. However, "Beginning in 1859, a series of letters from Episcopal Bishop Henry B. Whipple at Faribault, Minnesota, to the presidents of the United States and to the heads of the Indian Bureau, pled for an end to political appointments."⁵⁰⁹ Bishop Whipple heavily lobbied for the removal of unprincipled political actors who sought to exploit the native population. Instead, he argued for a policy that would lead to the assignment of men to

these posts who exemplified outstanding Christian moral character. Fritz writes of Bishop Whipple's policy proposal,

“As Whipple saw it, ‘Every employee ought to be a man of purity, temperance, industry, and unquestioned integrity.’ He suggested that the government establish legal machinery on the reservations and provide a United States commissioner with power to try violators of Federal Indian legislation. The tribes should be concentrated on large reserves in order to protect them better from ‘fire water’ and the ‘corrupt influence of bad men.’ Tribal annuities should be paid in goods rather than in cash; aid given in the building of houses; good schools provided; agricultural implements supplied; and land distributed individually to tribal members with inalienable patents.”⁵¹⁰

As a result of such lobbying efforts, Bishop Whipple not only became a leading advocate for this issue, “some of his proposals became a part of the ‘Peace Policy’”⁵¹¹ as well. Consequently, the legislating of the Peace Policy resulted in the Grant Administration working directly with Christian bodies to achieve some of the prescribed social policy initiatives detailed by Bishop Whipple above.

Then on January 2, 1874, the office of the Catholic Commissioner submitted a letter to the Secretary of the Interior stating the Roman Catholic Church's intention to appoint a permanent representative in Washington, D.C., that would consult Congress and the Administration, and to generally “take charge of the interests of the old Catholic mission amongst the Indians.”⁵¹² In an attempt to further outline the precise duties of this newly established office, the letter clarifies that it “is charged with the protection and furtherance of the temporal and spiritual interests of our Catholic Indian Missions, so far as either may be affected by the administration of Indian affairs at this Capital...”⁵¹³ The establishment of this office was the initial step in the direction of instituting a Roman Catholic permanent lobbying organization in Washington, D.C.

Interestingly, the Grant Administration promulgated a policy of proselytization to the Native American population, as a principal and strategic objective directly aligned with this government and church partnership. This historical detail is documented in a missive of Catholic Commissioner for Indian Affairs to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. It reads, “It is, briefly, the intention of the [Grant] administration to make the effort to evangelize and christianize the Indians, and to do so through the religious societies of the country, which are made a ‘missionary branch’ of the Government for that particular purpose.”⁵¹⁴ Clearly, this is an example of government/church collaboration—resultant from direct lobbying pressure on the part of denominational bodies—that demonstrates zero concern on the part of government

or church bodies over violating the sacred and unscalable wall that should exist between church and state. In this historical example, the U.S. government made no qualms about overtly utilizing governmental resources to spread Christianity with the aim of transforming the moral behaviors of the Native American population. The primary point of contention ensuing from this policy initiative on the part of the Roman Catholics was not, in principle, the diffusion of Christianity as a political tool of government, but the biased approach in which the government acted in selecting grant awardees amongst Christian denominations. Christianity was broadly embraced, while denominational particularism was rejected. Charles Ewing, the Catholic Commissioner, writes in regards to this matter,

“So understood, the President's policy is humane, philanthropic and christian, as it intends to protect and help the Missions indiscriminately, without interfering with the freedom of any of the churches or the liberty of conscience of the individual.

But the policy is not carried out according to its spirit and letter. Contrary to the expressed intention of the President, the appointment of more than thirty agents which should have been given to the Catholic Church, because it was the first and only successful missionary among the Indians of these agencies, were given to favorite Protestant Churches, by whom they are still held despite the protests of the Indians and of our Church. Missions that have been for hundreds of years Catholic, and Indians to the number of 80,000, who profess the Catholic faith, have been given to the charge of different denominations of Protestants; and this, in direct violation of the unquestioned right of all Christians, who live under our constitution, to perfect freedom in the worship of Almighty God.”⁵¹⁵

In terms of governmental subsidies, President Grant avowed that church bodies that were already engaged in work amongst the Native American population would be the first in line for consideration when the policy was enacted.⁵¹⁶ However, after enacting the policy, the Catholic Church found itself overlooked as grants were doled out to other ecclesiastical entities. Consequently, it established the Office of the Catholic Commissioner for Indian Missions to lead its lobbying efforts to ensure the Roman Catholic Church received a fair share of grant funding, so as to support their missions within the Native American population. This was followed, as stated above, by the establishment of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions in 1881, one of the first CLOs in Washington, D.C. In addition to its lobbying mandate, this church-based lobby organization managed the grant for which the Roman Catholic Commissioner successfully petitioned the U.S. government.

Moreover, as Protestant Churches and the Roman Catholic Church sought to engage in social programs which they developed and envisioned best served Native Americans, they clearly regarded the government as a potential partner that could equally benefit from a joint effort. Thus, the government was encouraged to embrace and implement policy proposals presented first by Bishop Whipple as a form of a creative socio-political collaboration between church and state. Consequently, this method of collaboration resulted in addressing a convergence of mutual concerns, while simultaneously providing the corresponding Christian bodies with funding vital to achieving their proposed objectives.

However, considering a countervailing perspective in direct relation to this kind of collaboration, the result of providing such provisions—financial or material—on the part of the U.S. government to church groups, inherently created a relationship of dependency in conjunction with those specific church interests. As such, their Christian witness and service to people in need is undeniably dependent upon resources controlled by the state. The question that arises is how does this form of dependency positively and negatively impact these churches' mission and witness in the long term? Regardless of one's specific opinion of the effects of such a model of collaboration, in such cases, specific social services rendered by these religious bodies and supported fiscally by the state inherently convene interrelated self-interests no matter how altruistic in essence or appearance. Therefore, one may rightly conclude mutual self-interest serves as a key impetus in this type of lobbying to producing this form of collaboration between Christian bodies and government.

Following in the footsteps of the Roman Catholic Church were other denominations that, at the turn of the twentieth century, decided to establish their individual denominational offices on Capitol Hill to impact legislation. Specifically, "The Christian Science Church and the Seventh-day Adventist Church were among the first religious traditions to establish permanent advocacy offices in Washington. The Christian Scientists established their office around 1900. The Adventist Church—which places great emphasis on religious freedom at home and abroad, in part because of its Saturday Sabbath—established a permanent advocacy office in 1901."⁵¹⁷ The establishment of these offices pointed to an abiding concern held by individual denominations that their interests required being protected and advanced through lobby actions on Capitol Hill. "The Christian Scientists," specifically, as Ebersole corroborates, "have been in Washington protecting their practice since around 1900."⁵¹⁸

Accordingly, a key characteristic of some of these initial CLOs is that of engaging the political process through lobbying as a means, not necessarily to achieve a social justice, moral or ethical objective; but to win legislative advantages in support of their particular denominational interests.

This model of political engagement gradually captured the attention of other Christian denominations, as is evident in the incremental increase of newly founded CLOs in the early part of the 1900s. “Many of the larger denominations,” moreover as Robinson reveals, “followed suit, and by the second decade of the twentieth century, religious denominations with advocacy offices in Washington included the Methodist Episcopal Church (which became the United Methodist Church in 1968), and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America (founded in 1908 and eventually becoming part of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA).”⁵¹⁹

The Federal Council of Churches is arguably one of the most influential individual membership-based CLOs of that period. Its original mission was dedicated to the eradication of social and economic injustices prevalent in American society as a result of industrialization and urbanization. “In May 1908,” National Council of Churches records corroborate, “32 Christian communions met in Philadelphia to form the Federal Council of Churches. One of the Federal Council’s first achievements was to issue the ‘The Social Creed of the Churches,’ based on a report on horrendous conditions in factories and farms by Methodist minister Frank Mason North.”⁵²⁰ It was Rev. North’s report that highlighted the hellish living and working conditions existent in urban and rural areas. In an effort to address these societal concerns, on December 4, 1908, the ecclesiastical members of the FCC adopted the Social Creed of the Churches, a clarion call to churches throughout the United States to engage in advocacy. The Social Creed of Churches reads,

“We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial problems.

To us it seems that the Churches must stand:

For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life.
For the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, a right ever to be wisely and strongly safe-guarded against encroachments of every kind.
For the right of workers to some protection against the hardships often resulting from the swift crisis of industrial change.
For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions.
For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality.

For the abolition of child labor.
For such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.
For the suppression of the 'sweating system.'
For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practical point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.
For a release from employment one day in seven.
For a living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford."⁵²¹

This statement not only outlined the FCC's societal concerns; it provided a conceptual policy framework that would assist the organization in determining social, economic, and political priorities; it also provided a rubric through which the requisite legislative vehicles essential to achieving social justice would be chosen. Likewise, the Social Gospel served as a theological impetus for the FCC that encouraged the redeeming of societal institutions; hence, the FCC's approach to achieving social justice was not limited to government alone. As an example, they challenged industry and business leaders, as they encouraged workers' rights to collective bargaining.

As time progressed, the FCC became a powerful political actor in Washington, D.C., with far reaching influence throughout the United States. "Given its high prestige," Pratt concurs, "and exceptionally large inclusive membership (by 1929 over 20 million persons in 29 member churches) this essentially voluntarist approach proved eminently viable."⁵²² Its political vitality afforded its leaders access to political actors at the highest levels of government. Particularly impressive "was the Council's access to American Presidents and other high officials during the decade of the twenties. Its General Secretary and President Herbert Hoover, were on cordial personal terms."⁵²³

A key personality during the early years of the FCC was James Myers, the industrial secretary of the Federal Council of Churches. Myers "recognized the role of the state in supporting or undermining social change... [and] argued that the development of the labor movement was impossible unless 'our political life becomes permeated and controlled... by political forces with social vision.'⁵²⁴ Furthermore, "Myers prodded ministers to mobilize their constituencies on behalf of such issues as workers' compensation or child labor, and he regularly appeared before congressional hearings on behalf of workers' issues."⁵²⁵ He additionally lobbied for "right to organize"⁵²⁶ language, on workers part, to be included in the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA); however, this language was omitted in the final version of the

bill that passed in Congress.⁵²⁷ In Myers view, this was a clear legislative defeat, though it did not deter his lobbying efforts. In 1935, Myers labored to build the national grass roots support necessary to pass the National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act, of which he described as “the most important single measure before Congress so far as the freedom of our working people goes.”⁵²⁸ As a direct consequence of Myers’ lobbying efforts, Congress enacted the Wagner Act in 1935 “to protect the rights of employees and employers, to encourage collective bargaining, and to curtail certain private sector labor and management practices, which can harm the general welfare of workers, businesses and the U.S. economy.”⁵²⁹

The successes of the FCC’s lobbying efforts as detailed helps to clarify how this then-novel religio-political experiment began to take firm root in American political life. Permanent Christian lobby associations steadily captured the imagination of Christian religious groups throughout the country, as they proved to be a viable instrument to secure public policy interests.

A Brief History of Protestant CLOs Prior to 1970

By 1945, at the close of World War II, the number of established CLOs in Washington, D.C., had markedly increased. This was largely attributable to various church groups’ political activities surrounding the two world wars. Robinson clarifies certain historical details vis-à-vis the upsurge of CLOs during this period:

“World War II led to an increase in religious lobbying. The advent of the Selective Service Bill of 1940 brought about activism for conscientious objection from churches. For example, members of the pacifist Quaker Church formed the Friends Committee on National Legislation in 1943 to advocate for the protection of conscientious-objector status. Around this time, other Protestant denominations such as the Baptists, Congregationalists, Lutherans, and Presbyterians entered the national lobbying scene.”⁵³⁰

At this historical juncture, many Protestant groups converged on Washington, D.C., and established denominational offices with the sole intent of lobbying Congress. Here it is worthwhile to note that the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) is one of a limited number of CLOs founded as a result of the political challenges during that period that is currently in operation today. Needless to say, political challenges have changed since then; nevertheless, the organization’s general mission remains the same. FCNL currently defines its mission in the following terms: “The Friends

Committee on National Legislation lobbies Congress and the administration to advance peace, justice, opportunity, and environmental stewardship. Founded in 1943 by members of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), FCNL fields an expert team of lobbyists on Capitol Hill and works with a grassroots network of tens of thousands of people across the country to advance policies and priorities established by our governing General Committee.”⁵³¹ At its founding, however, FCNL’s initial actions were directed specifically toward ensuring the denomination’s voice and opinions were considered and, ideally, implemented by the national legislature in regards to policies around World War II. On the flow of events that led to the founding of the FCNL, one historian discloses,

“The Friends Committee on National Legislation was organized at a conference of about forty persons, representing fifteen Yearly Meetings, which met at Quaker Hill, Richmond, Indiana, on June 11 and 12 1943. The conference was under the leadership of members of the Friends War Problems Committee. It was voted to establish the Committee on National Legislation to implement the ‘concern’ that Friends have a ‘responsibility to contribute as best we may to the shaping of wise and right legislation in those areas in which our principles and the cause we believe in are most closely affected.’”⁵³²

The primary factors that compelled the Religious Society of Friends to take the first steps toward establishing a permanent lobbying organization, and what has driven its mission since, are clearly outlined in the above quote. It is, in one respect, to proactively engage in the legislative process—specifically on the federal level. Such proactive measures are not simply a matter of individual choice divorced from their deepest of religious convictions. Indeed the founders of FCNL perceived it as a moral obligation for adherents of their faith to engage in this way. The idea of assuming a passive or disengaged posture from the legislative process was to allow potentially antagonistic political forces to determine policy matters that directly impacted Quaker social, political, and religious life. In the face of such probabilities, members of the Society of Friends were inspired to establish FCNL as a way of counteracting policies adverse to their beliefs.

Furthermore, as revealed above, the Quakers were among a larger number of CLOs created and functioning in Washington, D.C., around this period in U.S. history. By the end of the 1940s, Brethren, Congregational, Presbyterian, Northern Baptist, Methodist, and Lutheran churches had either established CLOs offices in Washington that were operational, or they had designated personnel representing their denominational interests who frequently traveled to the nation’s capital in an attempt

to influence Congress. Additionally, African American denominations were amongst the number of CLOs founded at this period. Namely, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion (AMEZ) Church, one of the oldest African American denominations in the United States, was operating in Washington, and its lobbying concerns of that time mirrored African American societal concerns at large. As stated by Josephine Kyles, former director of the AMEZ church's earliest CLO's efforts, the church was focused on "legislation affecting the welfare of Negroes."⁵³³

In the 1930s, the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches (FCNC) was established. This ecumenical membership-based organization was founded by African American clergymen and served as a leading voice on socio-economic and political matters that directly affected the African American community. Describing the emergence of the FCNC, Mary R. Sawyer writes, "In 1933 Bishop Ransom issued a call for denominational representatives to assemble for a meeting to discuss a basis for united action. 'Impelled by a deep sense of the need of our racial group for an authoritative voice to speak for us on social, economic, industrial and political questions, and believing that a United Negro Church could best supply this need, a number of churchmen... met in Washington, D.C., January 5, 1934, and bound themselves together...'"⁵³⁴ for the stated purpose. As shown, the FCNC was established with clear political objectives, as it sought to achieve "racial justice" and "civil rights" for the African American community.⁵³⁵ At its very beginning, lobbying was considered an essential function to realize these objectives. It is for this reason, the FCNC initial constitution called for the establishment of the Washington Bureau Committee. "The Washington Bureau Committee... developed a sustained program. Indeed, the establishment of the Washington Bureau in the nation's capital in 1943 marks the second major stage in the life of the Fraternal Council,"⁵³⁶ Mary Sawyer reveals.

The National Association of Evangelical (NAE, which was explored in the previous chapter) is another notable membership-based CLO that came into being during this period. Founded in 1942, the NAE's mission is to "influence society for justice and righteousness and gather the many voices of evangelicals together to be more effective for Jesus Christ and his cause."⁵³⁷ As previously stated, the NAE was a conservative Christian response to the growing influence of the Federal Council of Churches. "The NAE would also wrestle," as public documents confirm, "...with its identity as compared with the National Council of Churches to the left..."⁵³⁸ In an effort to gain greater influence, the NAE found itself aligning more closely with the

Republican Party. During the formative years of the NCC, it was known for its nonpartisan approach to lobbying as it sought to gain bipartisan consensus for legislative priorities. “There were progressive Republicans and conservative Democrats in Congress, and the NCC lobbied them all. Before ideology, party, and theology became so strongly correlated (especially for Protestants), the NCC claimed to speak for a broad swath of American society,” Lupfer shares.⁵³⁹ This would change during the last decade of the twentieth century, “[as] the NCC was widely seen as a religious arm of the Democratic Party, just as the religious right was little more than the Republican Party at prayer.”⁵⁴⁰ As the NCC and like-minded liberal Protestants migrated toward the Democratic Party, the NAE and like-minded conservative Protestants gravitated toward the Republican Party. “By the end of the 1980s,” in fact, “evangelical voters had become an essential part of the Republican base. Republican candidates and party leaders actively sought evangelical voters, crafting issue appeals to win their support.”⁵⁴¹

The public policy concerns pursued by the various CLOs mentioned above certainly varied. For some, their primary focus was “to analyze political trends”⁵⁴² of that era. Naturally, such analyses often catalyzed lobbying activities focused on an array of public policies perceived most pertinent to the corresponding denomination’s political interests and Christian witness. For example, the Council for Social Action, which was established by the Congregational Churches, “from time to time acted on specific legislation, particularly in the fields of social welfare and international relations.”⁵⁴³ Whereas, the Council on Christian Progress, the Northern Baptist lobbying organization, focused on any and all public policies pertaining to “Christian Family Relations, Industrial Relations, Race Relations, Social Evils, and World Order.”⁵⁴⁴ And the Methodists’ “chief concern” was “international affairs and foreign policy.”⁵⁴⁵ This decidedly international focus was a direct result of their missionary activities in the Far East.⁵⁴⁶ For the NAE, the priorities for their Washington, D.C., office at its founding included “supporting evangelical chaplains, assisting mission agencies in dealings with the State Department, championing the cause of religious broadcasting to the Federal Communication Commission, and defending religious liberty.”⁵⁴⁷ On the whole, much of the lobbying work of these CLOs was reactive, although not exclusively. As Congress considered legislative matters of interests, these groups would respond through lobbying activities in support for or against legislative

proposals in circulation. In certain cases, they offered policy recommendations in alignment with their denominational interests.

Additionally, although these CLOs maintained their particular public policy interests and often pursued them with diligence, there were, however, certain occasions when they collaborated on joint lobbying campaigns to achieve specific legislative objectives. “During 1940,” namely, “the Brethren coöperated actively with the Friends and the Mennonites in securing consideration for conscientious objectors to military service.”⁵⁴⁸ The idea that members of these pacifist Christian denominations would be forced to engage in military conflict convinced even traditionally apolitical religious groups like the Mennonites to join ranks in solidarity with these other likeminded Christian bodies. Hence, with the backing of their denominations, these CLOs united and supported legislation that allowed for the opting out of combat for their members, and other citizens broadly, who were opposed to participating in war. This is one clear example of a few of the first established CLOs coalescing around a particular policy concern to build an ecumenical political coalition in pursuit of a common agenda.

In terms of the growth in the number of newly established Protestant CLOs in the decades after the 1940s, data reveals limited growth up until the advent of the Civil Rights Movement. While the timeframe between World War I and shortly after World War II shows a noticeable increase in CLOs established, during the next two decades, records reveal no such gains. Robinson further discloses, “While growth in the religious lobbying market slowed between 1950 and 1970, a number of Jewish advocacy groups formed in the wake of the Holocaust and the creation of the State of Israel. The Civil Rights movement of the 1960s also led to a wave of religious advocacy groups...”⁵⁴⁹ Furthermore, to expound upon the exponential growth of religious lobbying groups that followed at the close of the 1960s, Robinson offers the following insights:

“The political science literature is replete with theories as to why there was such a large explosion of religious interest groups entering the lobbying scene in the 1970s. Explanations include a general rise in public religious expression, a trend toward the institutionalism of political activism in America more generally, the continued growth of the federal government in everyday life, as well as the backlash against the Warren Court’s expansive interpretation of various individual rights, including a right to an abortion, and the ever increasing restriction of the involvement of religion in government institutions, such as schools.”⁵⁵⁰

What is clearly absent from the foregoing list of theories within the political science literature Robinson mentions is the prior point he raised about the effect of the Civil

Rights movement in fomenting the wave of religious lobbying groups that took shape in the subsequent years. The veracity of this claim has been demonstrated throughout this study.

James L. Adams, however, proves the above point best in his pioneering work entitled, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*. He meticulously documents the course of political events that led to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The influence of ecclesiastical lobbying organizations in achieving this legislative milestone takes center stage in his work. Furthermore, the awakening of divergent church bodies to the power of lobbying is highlighted in great detail. Adams clearly credits the initiation of this wave of lobbyism to African American clerical and lay leadership who set in motion the Civil Rights Movement, as his primary focus remains on the various church-based and individual membership-based CLOs, in and outside of the African American community, that entered into the fight for racial justice.

A major denominational body that emerged in the early 1960s and supported the efforts of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther, Jr. was “the Progressive National Baptist Convention, an African American Baptist group formed during the civil rights movement...”⁵⁵¹ This convention “opened a Washington office in 1961.”⁵⁵² This office worked collaboratively with other African American civil rights organizations, including the SCLC, the NAACP, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Each of these organizations maintained their distinct connections with African American ecclesiastical leaders and bodies.

Moreover, these organizations’ grass roots efforts and their collaborative direct lobbying activities with various Protestant and Catholic lobby agencies spurred the civil rights movement onward. “Protestant denominations,” however, “moved into the civil rights struggle at differing speeds. The liberal, free-wheeling United Church of Christ had had a long history of concern for racial justice... The General Synod in 1959 called upon churches to pray and work for ‘the end of racial segregation and discrimination.’”⁵⁵³ The Methodist Church was more cautious in entering the struggle for racial justice due to the fact that a “third of the denomination’s membership lived in the South...”⁵⁵⁴ The United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. was, however, a leading voice and “was one of the first communions to form a Commission on Religion and Race. And in 1960, the church came out with a controversial endorsement of civil disobedience... The church’s highest official, the Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, Stated

Clerk, later would... attract national headlines by being arrested and jailed in Baltimore.”⁵⁵⁵ In 1957, the National Catholic Welfare Conference released a statement in favor of civil rights by condemning discrimination as being “injurious to human rights” and asserting that it “cannot be reconciled with the truth that God has created all men with equal rights and equal dignity.”⁵⁵⁶

National Council of Churches, as an individual membership-based CLO, was particularly influential in “mobilizing its vast resources for passage of the Civil Rights Act.”⁵⁵⁷ Additionally, labor unions, like the AFL-CIO, and political organizations, like Americans for Democratic Action (one of its founding members being Reinhold Niebuhr) were key allies in ensuring the passage of this historic legislation. It is interesting to note the NAE publicly condemned discriminatory practices amongst its constituencies but “avoided participation... in the Civil Right bill lobby.”⁵⁵⁸ Despite the NAE’s apolitical posturing, and the Methodist hesitancy, the flurry of ecclesiastical lobbying on the part of the other organizations mentioned, and the successes that resulted from their activity, provided religious bodies a viable model for political engagement to positively impact the social, economic, and political conditions of that period. As James correctly suggests, the achievement “of the Civil Rights Act may have done more TO the church than it did FOR the Negro. Activist churchmen, having tasted the sweet fruits of a political victory, would no longer rely on moral suasion as the best means to achieve social justice.”⁵⁵⁹

In review, it was through the civil rights movement that many ecclesiastical bodies came to recognize lobbying as a practical means to put their faith into action to transform societal conditions at variance with their Christian convictions. Several religious groups embraced the lobbying strategies gleaned from the civil rights movement as a means to affect the national trajectory by countering liberal Protestant values; promoting conservative Christian values; or recovering social, economic and political control. Furthermore, the civil rights movement, with the assistance of mass media, aided in enlightening the multitudes to the plight of African Americans; while these news reports simultaneously demonstrated the power of protestation and lobbying. Thus, religious bodies of various theological stripes became further enlightened to the efficacy of this kind of political engagement. “The civil foment of the 1960s,” as Hertzke rightly suggests, indelibly, “...left its imprint on the religious advocacy landscape.”⁵⁶⁰

As one reflects on the political history of the United States, there is a clear historical correlation between heightened ecclesiastical civic involvement, particularly at the various times in which the nation faced its most daunting social, economic, or political trials. In the face of slavery, war, civil inequalities, moral challenges, or comparable adversities, such moments have evoked responses from various Christian groups and inspired countless men and women to action. There are also those historical illustrations of ecclesiastical groups whose dwindling social, economic, and political influence, prompted them to act. No matter the political objective, these various church bodies' actions were generally directed at confronting governmental powers in an effort to shape public policies in accordance with their Christian worldview.

By the end of the 1960s, CLOs as a political force provided a suitable and appealing framework to express such opinions. In fact, the 1960s served as a watershed moment for ecclesiastical lobbying by broadly projecting this blueprint nationally, which was eventually adopted by numerous Christian groups as their chosen preference for political engagement. Indubitably, one effect of the political causes that permeated the 1960s was this consequence in the years to follow.

A Brief History of the Roman Catholic CLO Prior to 1970

By the 1940s, however, differing from the sundry of denominationally constituted Protestant CLOs that were attempting to burgeon into full-fledged lobbying organizations at that time in Washington, D.C., the sinews of the Roman Catholic Church's lobbying power as a distinct ecclesiastical entity were well-established. By this period in history, it had functioned as a viable political force for over a half century. The initial institution that housed the Roman Catholic Church's lobbying activities—which remains to date in an evolved organizational form—is correctly traced back to 1917.⁵⁶¹ Accordingly, in August of that year, the Roman Catholic Church founded the National Catholic War Council (NCWC), which metamorphosed today into what is known as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB).

The NCWC's founding resulted from a decision by the Roman Catholic Church Bishops that an organizational presence in Washington, D.C., would be the preferred means by which to effectively engage the U.S. government, specifically around policy issues involving the church's response to World War I. In effect, the USCCB is the historical consequence of this early Catholic association to influence national policy

around World War I. Additionally, the USCCB continues to hold fast to its initial mandate of directing the Roman Catholic Church's federal lobbying activities, amongst a range of other undertakings.

USCCB archival records describe its history as follows:

“In 1917 the bishops of the U.S. formed the National Catholic War Council (NCWC) to enable U.S. Catholics to contribute funds and commit personnel to provide spiritual care and recreation services to servicemen during World War I. In 1919 Pope Benedict XV urged the hierarchy to join him in working for peace and social justice. In response, the bishops organized the National Catholic Welfare Council in 1919 and set up the first Administrative Committee of seven members to handle the Council's business between plenary meetings. At that time the headquarters were established in Washington, DC and a general secretary with some staff was appointed.

The word ‘Conference’ soon replaced ‘Council’ in the organization's title, underlining the fact that it was consultative rather than legislative. At the same time, in 1922 the National Catholic Welfare Conference was created to address such concerns as education, immigration and social action.

This model continued until 1966 when the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) [formerly the National Catholic Welfare Council] were established...

On July 1, 2001 the NCCB and the USCC were combined to form the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). USCCB continues all of the work formerly done by the NCCB and the USCC with the same staff.”⁵⁶²

In this account, the principal commitment of engaging Congress and the administration through lobbying as conceptualized at the inception of the NCWC's founding is not explicitly articulated. However, the *American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives* affirms lobbying as a key factor and informs, “the War Council was an emergency organization that represented Catholic interests in the U.S. Congress, addressed the needs of soldiers at home and overseas, promoted the Americanization of recent immigrants, and developed a Program for the Social Reconstruction of American society after the war.”⁵⁶³ Alongside, the idea to organize, the NCWC reflected a certain shift in public opinion, particularly for those Catholics of varied European backgrounds who, instead of their country of origin, came to view the United States as the nation most worthy of their political allegiance. Hence, the NCWC in particular, and World War I in general, provided American Catholics with a “source of approval of their patriotism and loyalty.”⁵⁶⁴

To further expound on this point, what resulted during the initial stages of World War I was a propensity for certain U.S. Catholics to favor belligerent European countries where their familial ties existed, or those that best advanced the political

interests of their country of origin. Conversely, held in contempt by some of these same Catholic groups were those nations with longstanding political animosities toward their native land.⁵⁶⁵ Sentimental leanings in such directions purportedly led to certain divisions within the Catholic community, but were in fact mostly overcome after the United States entered into the conflict on the side of the allied forces.⁵⁶⁶ In detailing the patriotic coalescing of Catholics as American enthusiasts during World War I, Byrnes writes, “once the United States was actually a belligerent, Catholic support was widespread and enthusiastic.”⁵⁶⁷ Byrnes continues, “American Catholics self-consciously fought, ‘not only for the United States but also to make manifest the loyalty of all Catholics, native and foreign born.’”⁵⁶⁸ Consequently, this nationalistic fervor contributed to the Catholic Bishops’ decision to create the NCWC as an organizational presence in Washington D.C., specifically focused on facilitating Catholic involvement in support of the United States government engagement in World War I. James H. Ryan, former Executive Secretary of the NCWC, in recalling the history of the founding of the War Council, reiterates this fact: “The National War Council was created by the Hierarchy. It was to be the organization through which the great services of all Catholic agencies, as well as of individuals, would be directed to the accomplishment of the war aims of the United States.”⁵⁶⁹

Furthermore, there existed within the NCWC a subdivision specifically dedicated to leading lobbying efforts that served as the precedent for the future Catholic organizational lobbying framework. Slawson raises a similar point in his study entitled, *The Foundation and First Decade of the National Catholic Welfare Council: Modeling an activity that would help give rise to the National Catholic Welfare Council was the Committee on National Catholic Interests which monitored legislation and presented the church’s view.*⁵⁷⁰ This committee—established within the Council—focused exclusively on keeping an eye on federal legislation, as well as engaging legislators or federal officials as seen fit by the Catholic Bishops who mandated their organizational priorities. To further highlight this point, official documents published by the Catholic Bishops during that period show that this was categorically one of the primary objectives for the NCWC’s initial formation. The Administrative Committee of the Bishops in 1918 issued the *Handbook of the National Catholic War Council*, which specified the role of the “Committee on National Catholic Interests” as being, “chiefly concerned with watching the ruling of the various departments, with the view to bring sympathetically to various governmental agencies

the Catholic position and sensibilities on questions of policy affecting the entire country.”⁵⁷¹ Thus, lobbying was an agreed upon method to engage national government in matters of Catholic interest at this crucial juncture in history.

Hence, the Roman Catholic Church’s enduring model of a permanent lobbying organization was instituted. As previously noted, in light of the multiple title changes that organization experienced throughout the years, the objective to influence legislation, as a denominational body, remained central. Albeit, the public policy issues or concerns have altered depending upon the national or international political climate; as well as the prevailing moral or social issues of the time and the requisite solutions essential to effectively addressing such concerns. Additionally, the church’s unique legislative interests that were, at times, clearly motivated by self-interest to secure particular policy advantages or safeguards has also evolved over time. In fact, such variables were jointly present at the close of World War I. Thus, the reorganizing of the War Council was necessary to simultaneously meet contemporary needs and the church’s interests.

Consequently, “On the morning of 24 September 1919, ninety-five bishops, representing eighty-seven of one hundred dioceses, assembled at Catholic University for the first annual meeting of the hierarchy. Gibbons opened the convention with a brief address... ‘The social and political conditions of the country, as well as the religious,’ he told them, ‘point to the necessity of forming a permanent organization of the Hierarchy.’”⁵⁷² This initial meeting led to successive meetings that eventually resulted in the approval and establishment of the NCWC. James H. Ryan further elucidates on the history: in “the Pastoral Letter of the archbishops and bishops of the United States (September 1920) addressed to the clergy and laity under their charge... the purposes and nature of that National Catholic Welfare Council were explained in the following words:

“In view of the results obtained through the merging of our activities for the time and purpose of war, we determined to maintain, for the ends of peace, the spirit of union and the co-ordination of our forces. We have accordingly grouped together, under the National Catholic Welfare Council, the various agencies by which the cause of religion is furthered. Each of these continuing its own special work in its chosen field, will now derive additional support through general co-operation. And all will be brought into closer contact with the Hierarchy, which bears the burden alike of authority and of responsibility for the interests of the Catholic Church.

Under the direction of the Council and, immediately, of the Administrative Committee, several departments have been established, as

follows: The Department of Education, Department of Press and Publicity, Department of Laws and Legislation, Department of Social Action, and Department of Lay Organizations.

The task assigned to each is so laborious and yet so promising of results, that we may surely expect, with the divine assistance and loyal support of our clergy and people, to promote more effectually the glory of God, the interests of His Church, and the welfare of our country.”⁵⁷³

Consequently, this restructuring effort sought to address the contemporaneous challenges confronted by the Roman Catholic Church at that juncture in history, while simultaneously instituting a political method of engagement that proved effective in achieving public policy objectives. Hence, in the subsequent years, from the Great Depression to the zenith of the civil rights movement, the NCWC functioned as the principal lobbying mechanism for Catholics in Washington, D.C.

Chapter 3

An Oral History of CLOs

Methodological Approach: Oral History Interviews and Thematic Data Analysis

A historian of distinction once noted, “Everyone needs a history, especially those who seek to change the future.”⁵⁷⁴ Correspondingly, CLOs have historically been in the business of shaping public policies in order to impact or change existent social, economic, and political realities that will impact future conditions. The present reality, however, is that there is a shortage of historical scholarship written specifically within the academic discipline of Church History that investigates and provides acute analyses into this ecclesiastical phenomenon. The object of this study has been to assist in breaking up the soil of this relatively uncultivated topic to provide a history that simultaneously contributes to the field of knowledge while offering future practitioners, who may live out their Christian faith in this very public way, with a source of historical reflection as they seek to change the future.

To accomplish this task, the assembling of firsthand knowledge reflecting the diversity of perspectives held by the categories of CLOs highlighted in this study is essential. Therefore, an array of primary source materials, produced by the various organizations investigated, were consulted. Additionally, interviews were conducted with past and present executive staff members of three theologically diverse CLOs whose policy agendas substantively reflect that contrast—Bread, CWA and USCCB’s OGR. Each provided a distinct model of CLO types that aids in capturing a more comprehensive view of CLOs’ activities and their impact in general. Interviews were conducted with the following leaders whose extensive knowledge, experience and insights provided valuable content for writing the ensuing chapter: Rev. Arthur Simon, founder and president emeritus of Bread; Rev. David Beckmann, former president of Bread; Kenda Bartlett, current Executive Director of CWA; Hannah Wegman, Senior Policy Analyst of CWA; Stephen Colecchi, current Director of the Office of International Justice and Peace at the USCCB; the late Ambassador Robert Thomas Hennemeyer, former U.S. Ambassador to Gambia and former Director of the Office of International Justice and Peace at USCCB; and Gerard F. Powers, current Director of Catholic Peacebuilding Studies for the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies and former director of the Office of International Justice and Peace at the USCCB. Each

of these individuals provided their unique perspective into each organization's origin, the historical context and conditions that led to their founding, current and past organizational structures, their decision-making processes, public policy positions, theological formulations, lobbying campaigns, and their impact in terms of public policy achievements.

Clearly, the perspectives shared in the interviewing process are limited in number. This limitation is acknowledged for both the quantity and professional designations of the interviewees, as their experiences rank solely among executive leadership within the CLOs consulted. Thus, professional, administrative, and other pertinent staff members' voices are not directly reflected in the data presented. Omitting certain sources whose empirical input could augment the analysis presented knowingly narrows the study; however, this study's primary focus remains on these leading executive voices. Undoubtedly, the need remains for future research that will analyze other sources of empirical data, specifically those voices absent from the work currently presented.

Since recorded interviews serve as the key primary source material for gathering knowledge about the CLOs in consideration, *oral history*, as a methodology, is the scientific approach applied in writing this chapter. This approach will afford greater insight into these CLOs' histories, inner-workings, theological underpinnings, and impact on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, the origin of oral history as a methodology can be traced back to historians of antiquity. "Most writers," as Yow confirms, "begin books on oral history by reminding readers that the first oral historian was Thucydides, who sought out people to interview and used their information in writing the *History of the Peloponnesian War*."⁵⁷⁵ Keeping this factor in mind, it is argued that the interviewing and recording of the testimonies of eyewitnesses to historical events, in an effort to produce a historical work, has served as a methodological approach of choice by leading historians for centuries. Even today modern historians with their varied recording devices continue to openly embrace this technique as a primary method in their construction of history. "The modern Muses, as oral historians would have it, are men and women armed with tape recorders, in quest of firsthand knowledge that would otherwise decay. This they would capture, not for their own benefit, but 'for ay'—for libraries or other repositories to hold for the benefit of scholars of this and succeeding generations."⁵⁷⁶ The foregoing assertion is a fundamental goal of this study. By utilizing recorded interviews of Bread, CWA, and USCCB's OGR's former and present

executive leadership, it is the author's hope that these interviews will assist in creating a succinct historical account, highlighting some of the key experiences of some of the most influential Christian lobby practitioners of recent history. This study is also designed to aid in the education of future scholars, experts, or generally interested persons in the research topic at hand.

The fact that oral history is the chosen methodological approach utilized here means that this study is categorically qualitative. Consequently, the choice of a qualitative study of this type demanded an openness to discover unpredicted ideas and opinions that were not necessarily perceived at the onset of this research, but materialized during the various interviews. "One advantage in using qualitative methodology," Yow explains, "is that, because the researcher does not use an unchangeable testing instrument, he or she is open to observing the informants' choice of behaviors. In this way, the researcher learns new things not in an original hypothesis—in fact, many qualitative researchers do not form hypotheses at the beginning of the research."⁵⁷⁷ Furthermore, Yow highlights, "This possibility of discovering something not even thought of before is an advantage of the method."⁵⁷⁸ In this study, the verity of Yow's insights proved accurate. Aptly, a thesis was developed at the onset, however, due to new insights attained with each interview, it evolved over the course of the process.

Additionally, the process associated with producing an "*in-depth interview, recorded memoir, life history, the recorded narrative, taped memories, life review*—imply that there is someone else involved who inspires the narrator to begin the act of remembering, jogs memory, and records and presents the narrator's words."⁵⁷⁹ Consequentially, the interview process in general, including the structure of questions and the overall milieu for each interview, greatly contributed to the quality of outcomes in producing the oral history. These factors were prime considerations before and throughout each interview. As a result, much effort was made to create a comfortable environment for conversation that allowed for maximization knowledge output by the interviewees. Kvale's and Brinkmann's book entitled, *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*, provided valuable insight into the shaping of the interview process. As the authors contend, "Interview knowledge is produced in a conversational relation; it is contextual, linguistic, narrative, and pragmatic."⁵⁸⁰ Specifically in relation to interview questions, they suggest, "An interview question can be evaluated with respect to both a thematic and a dynamic dimension: thematically

with regard to producing knowledge, and dynamically with regard to the interpersonal relationship of the interview.”⁵⁸¹ As such, various questions were intentionally posed to gain insight about the topic investigated, while others were structured in such a way to build trust between the interviewer and interviewee so as to prompt a greater willingness to share essential data throughout the discussion.

Regarding the interview process itself, the initial expectation was to complete them all through video conference call. However, this was not the case. Four individuals were interviewed by telephone, while the other three persons were interviewed via video conferencing—either with FaceTime or Skype. Prior to conducting the interviews, an “interview guide” with several pertinent questions was developed.⁵⁸² In each conversation, interviewees were asked a similar set of pre-formulated, open-ended questions; though every interview maintained a distinct flexibility that allowed for inquiry into unscripted questions resulting from the direction and flow of topics in each therein. Each interview ranged from one hour and a half to two hours.

Regarding the number of interviews conducted, although seven people were interviewed in total, the above CWA staff members participated jointly, resulting in six initial interview recordings. Furthermore, and most unfortunate, the interview with David Beckmann was accidentally deleted. Consequently, only five interviews were transcribed and used as content for this chapter.

Lastly, *thematic analysis* is employed as the primary methodological approach to analyze the data that was attained from all the surviving interviews. Bryman describes the process of thematic analysis in the following terms: “The themes and the subthemes are essentially recurring motifs in the text that are then applied to the data. The themes and the subthemes are the product of a thorough reading and rereading of the transcripts or field notes that make up the data.”⁵⁸³ In view of this clarification, the following six distinct themes appeared after a meticulous reading of each interview transcript: 1) historical data, 2) organizational structure, 3) public policies, 4) grass roots and direct lobbying activities, 5) lobbying outcomes, and 6) theology. Fittingly, for all these emergent themes, one can expound on each separately in independently titled sections. However, an overlapping of themes was constant. Therefore, instead of having separate sections dedicated to each theme, the approach adopted was to produce a succinct and partial narrative history of each CLO with the identified themes interwoven throughout. The themes will be evident in the following sections detailing

the founding of each of these CLOs, as well as descriptions of specific lobbying illustrations selected to highlight the nature and impact of their efforts on Capitol Hill.

At times, a more descriptive approach is adopted to adequately address specific themes pertaining to “organizational structure” and the “public policy agenda” of the respective CLO under consideration. However, “theology,” as a theme, is organized under a separate heading in individual sections for each CLO investigated. This distinction facilitates a deeper investigation into indubitably the most central characteristic of CLOs’ capacity to aggregate, influence, and move their membership to engage in political action, and substantiate the policies pursued. Consequently, a terse descriptive analysis of the theological constructs formulated by each of the respective CLOs researched is examined.

Lastly, to achieve the overall aim of constructing a lucid depiction of this ecclesiastical phenomenon, primary source materials produced by each organization are consulted, as well as pertinent secondary sources relevant to shaping the historical context in which the illustrated lobbying activities take place. These sources function as essential supplemental material to the interview data analyzed, assisting in developing concise historical and theological profiles for Bread, CWA, and the USCCB’s OGR.

Bread for the World: A Mainline Protestant CLO Perspective

To better understand the factors that led to Bread for the World’s emergence as a permanent Christian lobbying organization of national prominence and influence, it is vital to capture a glimpse into the early life of its founder, the Rev. Arthur Simon.

Rev. Arthur Simon was born in Eugene, Oregon. The son of a Lutheran pastor, he was nurtured in a household where prayer, devotion to the teachings of Christ, and an accompanying public piety reflective of such lessons, were foundational to his spiritual formation. Arthur and his elder brother, the late Paul Simon (former U.S. Senator from Illinois), witnessed in their father’s personal expression of Christian faith a life dedicated to advocating on behalf of certain segments within the population that were victims of social injustice. Namely, in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor in 1942, their father was a vocal critic of the Roosevelt Administration’s policy “to imprison all people of Japanese descent on the West Coast in detention camps.”⁵⁸⁴ In response to this executive order, their father publicly criticized the actions of President Roosevelt

via radio broadcast and, “he wrote a letter to the editor of the local paper along the same line.”⁵⁸⁵

Many people from his local church and community condemned him for publicly adopting such a position against the President’s internment policy. Reflecting on those events, Simon confirms, “The people in the congregation, some of them didn’t like it. And at school, some of the kids would say, ‘Why did your Dad do this?’ And at the same time it was a little embarrassing for us kids, but we learned from that to really respect our Dad for having the guts to stand up for what was right.”⁵⁸⁶ Despite the public ridicule projected at Simon’s father for his advocacy then, today a monument stands in Eugene, Oregon, celebrating his courage during that period.⁵⁸⁷

This act, and ones like to it, left an indelible mark on the minds of both Arthur and Paul, as evident in their individual professional achievements. They too came to embrace their father’s expression of Christianity, laboring from his unique vantage point within the public square, ultimately converging at a point of intersection where assuaging socio-political injustices was principal. In Arthur’s case, his vocational pursuits were not aimed at seeking elected office like his brother Paul. Instead, he was moved to establish an institution that would serve as a leading voice amongst policymakers for alleviating the injustice of hungry and poverty in the United States and around the world. The road that led him to the founding of Bread is certainly worth considering in further detail.

In 1959, a few years after graduating from seminary, Arthur Simon received his first pastoral assignment, which was a call to serve as assistant pastor at St. John’s Lutheran Church in Denver, Colorado.⁵⁸⁸ Simon nostalgically recalls his feelings toward that city and the people that he came to serve at St. John’s, and pens, “Denver—the city, its people, the mountains just a few miles west, the weather—I loved all of it... And I thoroughly enjoyed the congregation...”⁵⁸⁹ The benefits of serving a congregation like that of St. John’s, in Simon’s opinion, were plentiful, and could have easily persuaded him to stay in Denver for the long-term. However, it was only a few years after his arrival there that he was challenged to leave the securities of that post, move across country, and serve as head pastor of a congregation in one of the poorest areas of New York City. In sharing the details surrounding this ministry transition, Simon details, “I received a... call from Trinity Lutheran Church in Manhattan, New York... Trinity was an exceptional situation: the “most inner” of the inner-city challenges. This caused me great discomfort, because I did not want to leave Denver or

St. John's, yet Trinity represented the kind of place that I had faulted the church for neglecting."⁵⁹⁰ In short, Simon was inspired, in part, by this lingering conviction that the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church could better serve disenfranchised segments of society; additionally, he realized that such a conviction required a personal commitment to lead in those efforts through positive action. Thus, with the prompting of trusted counsel, he ultimately accepted the call. "On Good Shepherd Sunday, April 16, 1961," he recounts, "twelve hours before the nation launched its disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, I was installed as pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, East Ninth Street and Avenue B, on Manhattan's Lower East Side."⁵⁹¹ It would be here—in the midst of the widespread hunger and poverty that Simon faced as pastor of Trinity Church—that the idea of Bread would first come into being.

Immediately upon his arrival in New York, the Lower East Side of Manhattan presented colossal challenges to this young pastor and Oregon native. Describing his initial impressions, specifically of the demographical makeup and local conditions of the Lower East Side during the early 1960s, he reveals:

"All of a sudden, you're surrounded by nothing but tall buildings and people. The precinct that I lived in, and at the church was located in, was less than one square mile and had more than one hundred thousand people. It was a very densely populated area and most of the people were poor economically, and it was a bustling neighborhood too. Lots of immigrants came off Ellis Island and settled in the Lower East Side; and, so, there were pockets of Italians, pockets of Ukrainians, pockets of Irish and Germans. And each one of them would leave... they'd better themselves and move out. But they'd leave some behind too. All of this is part of the mix. And then if you look also, African Americans were coming from the South; and then mostly Puerto Ricans. It had this great mix of people, but lots of problems."⁵⁹²

Simon goes on to specify those many problems: "Crime, substance abuse, broken homes, single parents, school dropouts, and empty refrigerators were commonplace."⁵⁹³ While Trinity Church was a rather small and homogenous congregation comprised mainly of German immigrants who clearly required Simon's pastoral care; Simon also understood his pastoral duties to extend beyond the church building into the multi-cultural community in which the church was set in order to share the love of Jesus Christ to a people largely beset by poverty and the social conditions as described.

Hence, as the years progressed, through Simon's labors he came to know the people in that community, their faces, their stories, and their struggles. In fact, his relational approach, coupled with both his evangelistic efforts and community outreach

strategies, led to numerical church growth; albeit, the socio-economic conditions that entangled many of his parishioners in a web of despondency showed little to no signs of relief. This perpetual quandary provoked deep introspection within Simon. Then one day after visiting the home of a struggling family within his congregation, he thought, “Tell their story.”⁵⁹⁴ Subsequently, he published his first work in 1966, detailing some of the stories of people he encountered while ministering on the Lower East Side, entitled, *Faces of Poverty*. Reflecting on the intent behind the book, Simon divulges, “I wanted people to see faces—real flesh-and-blood people from my own congregation, not abstract generalities or mind-numbing statistics—when thinking of poverty.”⁵⁹⁵ The hope he maintained was that *Faces of Poverty* would raise awareness about the plight of so many people he had come to know and serve as pastor, and fan the flames of compassion and solidarity within the hearts of individuals to whom such a reality was completely alien.

Alongside these very formative experiences at Trinity Church, the Civil Rights Movement played a major factor in informing the forthcoming mission and future advocacy approach of Bread, particularly Simon’s exposure to and active participation in some of the most notable demonstrations of that period, and adoption of strategies formulated by certain Civil Rights leaders like Jesse Jackson. On August 28, 1963, Simon marched with a delegation of Lutherans representing the “Lutheran Human Relations Association of New York” in the historic March on Washington.⁵⁹⁶ Later, he willingly embraced Dr. King’s call to clergy throughout the States and traveled to Alabama to participate in a second demonstration to cross over the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma.⁵⁹⁷ This was after the first effort on March 7, 1965 concluded with peaceful protestors—in the struggle to attain unobstructed suffrage for African Americans—violently attacked by law enforcement.⁵⁹⁸ Clearly aware of the dangers posed by participating in this second march, Simon, moved by his Christian conviction, mustered up the courage to do so.

As demonstrated, Simon’s participation in the Civil Right Movement functioned as an inspirational precursor that affected his view of Christian public engagement, later contributing to the formation of Bread. Moreover, all such activities were conducted while serving as pastor of Trinity Church, where the complexities of the social conditions remained a primary concern for him. Additional and more direct contact with Civil Rights leadership in the Chicago area, to which Simon attests, effectively addressed the quandaries he experienced while ministering on the Lower

East Side. The model he soon encountered in that city served as the conceptual basis for Bread's future political modus of engagement.

In the spring of 1968, Simon took extended time-off from his pastoral duties at Trinity Church to assist his brother Paul's political campaign for Lieutenant Governor in Illinois. "During my year working in Paul's campaign," Simons shares, "I had some contact with Jesse Jackson and [Operation Bread Basket]... There was a Southside of Chicago church where they had their Saturday morning meetings, and I went to some of those. And what really struck me was the way they combined their celebration of the faith with their social activism. You know getting out there, boycotting... And so that began to percolate in my mind too. How can we... make some connection like that on the Lower East Side?"⁵⁹⁹ In other words, this exposure to Operation Bread Basket and its distinct blending of Christian principles with social engagement provided Simon with a blueprint worthy of deeper consideration, specifically in terms of its application in his ministerial context back in New York City. Moreover, as Simon readily admits, the Civil Rights Movement provided a suitable model worth replicating in that it "had shown...how an extreme injustice could arouse people of faith and prompt action."⁶⁰⁰

After Paul's successful lieutenant gubernatorial run, Simon returned to Trinity Church in New York with the persistent conviction to somehow address the prevailing socio-economic maladies plaguing the Lower East Side. Still encouraged by his experiences on the Southside of Chicago, the precise issue or tactic to promote change in his ministerial context, however, remained unclear. How was he to integrate this type of religio-political concept into a viable ministry practice? What social issue should he tackle first, considering the plethora of problems in need of remedying? What role should Trinity Church play in promoting this social transformation? All these questions required answering.

Musing about his deliberations at that time, Simon shares, "I was interested in social policy but I wasn't looking to break away from the parish."⁶⁰¹ In his initial estimation, the policies pursued and methods adopted should not have required him to part ways with congregational life generally. Although Simon would eventually resign from his pastoral post at Trinity Church to lead Bread operations full-time, the perfect concept emerged that would satisfy his desire to preserve a connection with congregational life. It was through the adoption and modification of a spiritual/political practice within the context of local church that his hopes were realized. The "Offering of Letters"⁶⁰² provided Simon with the answer he was in search of. Since its founding,

this tool has wedded Bread with congregations of varied denominational backgrounds throughout the nation, and continues to function as the principal means by which Bread influences Congress. It is a grass roots organizing approach that emanated from the congregation and continues to be dependent upon congregational engagement. The Offering of Letters, in Simon's opinion, merges Christian principles with social activism in the context of the local church to effect systemic change. The history and process of the Offering of Letters will now be further explored.

It just so happens that the idea of conducting an Offering of Letters was proposed rather unwittingly by a member of Trinity Church, who at the time had no way of foreseeing its future embrace by thousands of congregations across the United States as their primary means of advocacy. The idea was proposed in the context of congregational deliberations on which social issue they would attempt to tackle in order to transform the conditions on the Lower East Side. In the end, this suggestion of an Offering of Letters emerged concurrently with the determined social issue that was to remain central to Bread's public policy focus throughout its existence. Simon shares the story of how this all transpired:

"In fact, it was within the parish during Lent. I guess it was 1969. We had a series... of discussions on different topics, and then afterward had a little communion service. And one topic we threw out there was the topic of hunger; and it just took off. People got into it because they could speak out of their own experience, and what they saw with their neighbors and friends. And then somebody made the suggestion... 'We always take up a collection for Lutheran World Relief. Why don't we take up a collection of letters, send it to our Congressman, and tell him to do something about hunger.'"⁶⁰³

From this point on, the hunger issue took center stage as the singular policy emphasis for his community of faith to engage legislatively; and the concept of the Offering of Letters provided the religio-political means for them to achieve public policy transformation related to that very same agenda.

At this point, it is essential to briefly divert from detailing the early history of Bread and examine the Offering of Letters as a lobbying strategy before proceeding. Bread asserts, "An Offering of Letters event—when people...[in a] congregation, campus, or group sit down together to write personalized letters or emails to members of Congress on specific issues—is an effective tool that helps shape our government's response to hunger."⁶⁰⁴ In other words, Bread purports this lobbying tactic as a viable method in influencing federal legislators directly to work toward the eradication of

global hunger and poverty. Moreover, the primary objective of this grass roots strategy is to have letters flowing into Congress from churches all across the country. Bread's regional organizers are assigned with task of having church representation—churches committed to the work of Bread—in all 435 Congressional districts in the United States. Their aspiration is to have each congregation participate in an Offering of Letters that will ultimately contribute to building an influential grass roots political movement that encourages “leaders to make global development a national goal—and retire from office those who cannot be persuaded.”⁶⁰⁵

Furthermore, David Beckmann, immediate past president of Bread, suggests, the Offering of Letters, although clearly a political device, is simultaneously a spiritual practice. The manner by which churches conduct the practical aspect of the event varies on a case-by-case basis. “Some churches,” he explains, “allow for letter writing in a worship service, or at least have people place their letters in an offering basket that is brought forward during worship. This action teaches everyone in church that letters to Congress are a fit offering to God and that citizenship is a part of stewardship. Other churches set up a letter-writing table during the coffee hour or present the Offering of Letters in Sunday school or a social action committee.”⁶⁰⁶ From Beckmann's perspective, the method by which a church conducts an Offering of Letters is largely dependent upon the contextual proclivities of the congregation that would maximize participation in those efforts. He further suggests understanding the theological weight attributed to the act is of particular importance.

Beckmann's comments reveal, that from Bread's perspective, the theological import of an Offering of Letters is that it is, in fact, an act of worship. Consequently, for Bread and its membership, the Offering of Letters is indubitably more than just a political contrivance; it is an extension of the sacrificial system as portrayed in the Hebrew Scriptures, and the various offerings associated with that system. Moreover, the Offering of Letters is directly connected to Christ's “own personal identification with different aspects of the system.”⁶⁰⁷ Of which a primary identification is: “Jesus as the sacrificial victim offered to God on the altar.”⁶⁰⁸ In Bread's viewpoint, the Offering of Letters is an act of devotion, reflective of Christ's very own sacrifice and love—as expressed in his great salvific work on the cross that results in the reconciliation of humankind back to God. Additionally, the act of disciples' writing and sending letters to Congress, advocating for policies in the interests of poor and hungry people, reflects the depth of God's love and grace freely given to redeem a world fully incapable of

redeeming itself. Hence, the Offering of Letters, as an act of worship, signifies the eternal purpose of Christ and realizes an essential function of Christ's mandate to his disciples in that it faithfully extends God's love and grace—through public policy advocacy—to individuals and groups in society most in need.

The foregoing theological formulation partially explains the divine import Bread attributes to the Offering of Letters as a spiritual practice—one that undergirds its advocacy in general. However, expositions promulgated by the organization more intelligibly frame its theological position:

“We experience God's grace and love through our faith in the saving power of Jesus' death and resurrection. ‘We know love by this, that he laid down his life for us—and we ought to lay down our lives for one another’ (1 John 3:16).

In the Gospels, Jesus was compassionate to all people, especially the widow, the orphan, the stranger, the hungry, the poor, and the infirmed—the most vulnerable in society. Jesus loved all people—rich and poor—and actively cared for people in need. He urged his disciples to do the same.

As followers of Christ, we express and embody God's reconciling love at all times and in all places. Throughout the Scriptures, God speaks of our purpose to rebuild, restore, and renew all that is broken (Isaiah 61). We are called to work to end the brokenness of hunger and poverty in our communities, in our country, and in other countries.”⁶⁰⁹

It was in an effort to fulfill this theological basis—“to end the brokenness of hunger and poverty in our communities”⁶¹⁰—that the Trinity Church united around, and agreed to conduct the very first Offering of Letters during worship under Simon's pastoral leadership.

After Trinity Lutheran's first Offering of Letters (of which most posts were addressed to Congressman Farbstein), to many congregants' surprise, they actually received a reply from his office. However, in terms of the tangible impact of those letters on Farbstein's policies, Simon divulges, “I don't know if he did anything that changed the law at that point.”⁶¹¹ Nonetheless, the piqued interest evident in the congregation, as well as Simon's enthusiasm on the topic of anti-hunger advocacy generally, led to additional actions on the church's part—one of which was soliciting the involvement of the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church. Subsequently, Simon drafted a resolution that was considered by the denomination, “and the President of the church body appointed a commission.”⁶¹² It is unsurprising that Simon was appointed to that church commission to assist the larger denominational body in addressing the issue of domestic and international hunger more effectively.

As a result of this increasing momentum, Simon arrived at the conclusion that it was probably best to take some time away from Trinity Lutheran Church to “investigate the hunger issue more seriously.”⁶¹³ He dedicated most of this period writing a book, which he co-authored with his brother Paul, entitled, *The Politics of World Hunger*.⁶¹⁴ This in-depth study provided an array of statistical data on hunger, complemented by relatable anecdotal material that brought many of the cold hard figures therein to life. Additionally, on both the domestic and international fronts, puzzling social, economic, and political dilemmas were positioned with clear policy recommendations offered to rectify the problems related to global hunger.

Now equipped with sufficient insight into the topic of hunger, Simon began to raise the question within the local New York City community, “Why not organize a citizens’ outcry for hunger?”⁶¹⁵ He was met with different supportive and encouraging voices as he shared this vision of a Christian based grass roots political movement, and decidedly moved forward and assembled a core group of leaders amongst the clergy to assist in shaping the burgeoning organization. This initial group was ecumenical in composition—including both Catholics and Protestants—and, in Simon’s opinion, were astute and reputable individuals in the Christian community “with clear faith-and-justice commitments.”⁶¹⁶

In May of 1973, Bread released its initial public communication, which clearly articulated its missional intent in an effort to win over sympathizers favorable to its cause.⁶¹⁷ This communique addressed the necessity of instituting a grass roots movement led by churches by raising the following question:

“Why should an organization on world hunger deal with political and economic issues? Precisely because we want to show the link between hunger and poverty, between hunger and injustice. People are usually hungry because they are terribly poor. Enabling hungry people to feed themselves means dealing with the root causes of hunger. That requires us to help shape government policies, for U.S. policies often vitally affect the world’s hungry. BFW wants to organize citizen participation from within the churches on their behalf.”⁶¹⁸

Next, Simon assembled a board of directors, including the Rev. Eugene Carson Blake—the same Rev. Blake of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A who was a leading voice amongst church-based Protestant CLOs in the struggle for civil rights during the 1960s. As the recent former general secretary of the World Council of Churches, Blake consented to take on the role of Bread’s first chairman of the board.⁶¹⁹ As a figure of international notoriety, Simon reports, Blake “gave Bread visibility and respect.”⁶²⁰

Accompanying Blake on Bread's board of directors were several other prominent ministers. This factor, coupled with the implementation of Bread's initial Offering of Letters campaign, which began in November of 1973 and "pushed for U.S. funding for the International Development Association (IDA),"⁶²¹ were pivotal to Bread's future success. Consequently, in May of 1974, when Bread made its national launch, it did so with ardent support already in place across the country.

Since its beginnings, Bread has successfully, in a nonpartisan fashion, lobbied Congress on an array of domestic and international policies related to eradicating global hunger and poverty. In general, the rubric through which policies are pursued and advocated for is determined solely based on their effectiveness in eliminating these twin social concerns. As a result, Bread has historically advocated in support of or against a wide range of policies that directly or indirectly impact hunger and poverty. Beckmann, reflecting on Bread's early legislative victories, reveals, "Their biggest achievements in the 1970s and 1980s were the [Supplemental Nutrition Program for] Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and programs to reduce child deaths in developing countries."⁶²²⁶²³ In fact, its lobbying work on WIC continued throughout the following decade, and Bread reports that in 1994 and 1995, respectively, it "helped win a \$260 million increase for WIC."⁶²⁴

In terms of other specific domestic policy areas Bread has worked on in the past, social safety-net programs—like Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)⁶²⁵—were of particular focus. Indeed, a significant amount of Bread's lobbying activity is continuously focused on ensuring "adequate funding for nutrition assistance programs, which provide important benefits to children, elderly, disabled, and low-income persons."⁶²⁶ For example, Bread actively lobbied Congress on past Farm Bills, including the 2008 and 2014 bills, which it considered a necessity because multiple titles under these expansive pieces of legislation directly impact domestic and international hunger. In fact, Title IV, Nutrition, in the Farm Bill contains multiple programs, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), which the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), touts "as the first line of defense against hunger in the United States."⁶²⁷ As Bread informs, "82 percent of all SNAP benefits go to the most vulnerable households—those with children, elderly, or disabled people."⁶²⁸ Moreover, the Farm Bill also covers the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, which is essential to eradicating international hunger and poverty.⁶²⁹ Therefore, Bread argues in justification of its lobbying approach

that: “The Farm Bill can help put the United States on track to end food insecurity and hunger in our country and save millions of lives overseas.”⁶³⁰

Additional international policies aimed at achieving Bread’s broader organizational mandate of ending global hunger, and historically lobbied for by the organization, range from support of poverty-focused development assistance and advocating for humanitarian assistance during complex humanitarian crises; to seeking adequate funding for a range of bilateral and multilateral international food aid programs.⁶³¹ “In 1985,” a notable legislative victory in this area was evident when, “Bread for the World drafted legislation that established a Child Survival Fund within the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Congress approved the fund with an initial appropriation of \$25 million”⁶³²

In discussing the various international policies Bread has proved influential in helping to shape, the Jubilee Campaign, of 1999-2000, is another worth briefly outlining. This international campaign ignited a global wave of activism as advocates in the global north and south urged rich nations’ governments to relieve the financial obligations of poor nations that “were saddled with unpayable debts.”⁶³³ In order to persuade Congress to do just that, “In the United States, Jim McDonald from Bread for the World chaired the legislative coalition, working closely with staff from church bodies. Catholics, Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians—and Oxfam America, an international development charity—were core partners.”⁶³⁴ This diverse coalition of partners was complemented by a grass-roots approach that targeted key members of Congress that were particularly influential in moving the targeted legislation forward. David Beckmann retells one such incident,

“Representative Jim Leach, a moderate Republican from Iowa, also provided crucial leadership. He chaired the entire Financial Service Committee. Bread for the World staff couldn’t get in to see him. His staff insisted that the chairman was preoccupied with more important legislation.

But Tom Booker and other Bread for the World members got an appointment with Leach back home in Iowa City. Their appointment was late in the day, and Leach was running late. So Leach invited Tom to ride with him to the airport. Tom was not at all sure of himself, but he explained the idea of Jubilee.

When staff from Bread for the World and two church bodies finally got to see Leach in Washington a month later, Leach immediately offered to sponsor the legislation. Leach’s staffer was sitting next to me and literally almost fell off his chair in surprise.

The Financial Services Committee passed the debt-relief bill two weeks before the G8 Summit in the summer of 1999.”⁶³⁵

This example of the Jubilee Campaign, and the resulting debt-relief legislation passed, lucidly portrays the method, impact and intricacy of Bread's grass roots and direct lobbying activities aimed at Congress. Undoubtedly, not all of Bread's lobbying activities result in legislative victories of this degree. However, the essential factor here is that adequate historical evidence substantiates the claim that Bread's lobbying activity has impacted the realization of key policies directed at ending widespread hunger.

Next, the exact organizational process to determine legislative policy priorities will be considered. To reiterate, policy aims originate with Bread's executive leadership and staff. Generally, the executive leadership in consultation with the Government Relations staff suggest multiple legislative vehicles as top considerations for Bread's annual Offering of Letters Campaign. After these initial suggestions are formulated, members are consulted through polling for their top legislative issue of choice. The polling returns are then considered by executive leadership, who are not, however, bound to the results. Ultimately, after weighing all of these factors—and, in light of their expertise and opinion on Capitol Hill—the executive leadership proposes a legislative vehicle to the board of directors for their vote and approval. In the end, the annual campaign will focus on only one policy issue to maximize Bread's lobbying impact by mobilizing its national membership behind a solitary legislative concern.

The grass roots citizens' movement that Simon launched nationally in 1974 remains focused on its original intent. To-date, its most currently revised mission statement reflects that aspiration and advances, "Bread for the World is a collective Christian voice, urging our nation's decision makers to end hunger at home and abroad. Moved by God's grace in Jesus Christ, we reach out to our neighbors, whether they live in the next house, the next state, or the next continent."⁶³⁶ In order to realize this undertaking, in 2015, Bread reported its annual operational expenses at \$ 14,044,048.⁶³⁷ Consequently, with this considerable financial backing, coupled with its reported history of success, Bread has emerged as one of the most influential social justice-oriented membership-based CLOs in Washington, D.C.

Concerned Women for America: A Conservative Evangelical CLO Perspective

Concerned Women for America (CWA) was founded in the late 1970s at the early part of a four-decade period that, on the whole, saw unprecedented numerical

growth of religious-based lobbying organizations in Washington, D.C. In light of the civil rights movement, the emergence of several CLOs, like Bread and Sojourners, dedicated to seeking justice or achieving equal rights for disenfranchised groups recognized as vulnerable to or victims of systemic discrimination and oppression is of little surprise. CWA's origins, however, were quite different. It formed with the primary purpose of coalescing in the struggle *against* codifying equal rights language for women into the U.S. Constitution.

To better understand CWA's history and objectives, it is essential to briefly detail the content and history of the Equal Rights Amendment around which the organization formed to contest. Accordingly, "The Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was first proposed in Congress by the National Women's Party in 1923. The U.S. House of Representatives approved it in 1970; the U.S. Senate voted its approval in 1972. Thirty of the necessary thirty-eight states ratified the Amendment in 1973."⁶³⁸ Due to the candor and simplicity of the language within amendment itself, the legislation initially garnered little resistance—congressionally or nationally. It reads as follows:

"Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.
Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.
Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification."⁶³⁹

"Although the ERA was first proposed in 1923," Marshall confirms, "Congress passed it with little controversy in March 1972 and 30 states ratified it within the following 12 months."⁶⁴⁰ However, as she goes on to disclose, "The next year an opposition movement coalesced, and only 5 additional states ratified the ERA by its extended deadline in June 1982."⁶⁴¹

In general, the ERA "brought predominately white groups together on the religious right,"⁶⁴² and served as a rallying point for its contestation. Jerry Fallwell, leader of the Moral Majority, Pat Robertson, president of the Christian Broadcasting Network, and Tim LeHaye, mega-church pastor from Southern California perhaps best known for his *Left Behind* book series, were all "inclined to instruct their followers on issues, conduct voter-registration drives, engage in legislative lobbying, and target specific politicians for defeat."⁶⁴³ These actions, combined with CWA's founding and joining of the oppositional forces, brought the ratification of the ERA to a standstill.

Accordingly, CWA's early history reveals that the defensive lobby strategy to halt the ERA's ratification was engendered by its founders to counter the political advancements of the feminist leadership that lobbied for the ERA's realization. However, its broader aim was to thwart what its leadership and members perceived as feminism's growing ideological influence upon American culture, which conflicted with CWA's Christian values. Confirming these instigating factors, its organizational archives reveal, "Beverly LaHaye watched a television interview of Betty Friedan, founder of the National Organization for Women. Realizing that Friedan claimed to speak for the women of America, Beverly LaHaye was stirred to action. She knew the feminists' anti-God, anti-family rhetoric did not represent her beliefs, nor those of the vast majority of women."⁶⁴⁴ Beverly LaHaye, founder of CWA (wife of Tim LaHaye), was additionally informed of a personal contact's experiences at the National Women's Convention in Houston, Texas during November of 1977. The information concerning the atmosphere and overall proceedings at that event left her unsettled. In her book entitled, *Who But A Woman? Concerned Women Can Make A Difference*, LaHaye describes in detail what she learned from that acquaintance and her immediate response to the information acquired:

"The political and social agenda of the Houston convention was even more disturbing. Ignoring fairness or parliamentary procedures, the feminists pushed through such resolutions as the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment; the 'right' of homosexuals and lesbians to teach in public schools and to have custody of children; federally funded abortion on demand; approval of abortion for teen-agers without parental knowledge or consent; federal government involvement in twenty-four-hour-a-day child care centers and more."⁶⁴⁵

She goes on to underscore, "Those feminists had managed to convince Congress to spend five million dollars of our tax money to hold state conventions and then this grand finale at Houston, which seemed to be a Marxist/lesbian circus, manipulated and controlled from the beginning by a dissident group of feminists who were demanding federal intervention into our lives."⁶⁴⁶ In view of this secondhand account, LaHaye shares, "My nausea soon changed to rage, and I determined in my heart that I would do whatever was necessary to raise up a standard of righteousness against feminism."⁶⁴⁷

As a result, she immediately began to organize a counter response with her initial group of adherents being women connected to her faith community. "Not long after that," she reveals, "nine of us met at a friend's home to discuss what we could do to alert the Christian community to the feminist and humanist threat."⁶⁴⁸ Their strategy

was simple. “During the next four months,” she conveys, “we held something like sixty ‘coffees’ with other women in the San Diego area. We met to discuss the Equal Rights Amendment and other associated issues.”⁶⁴⁹ Moreover, she asserts, “We realized that anything we tried to accomplish had to be of the Lord or our work would be in vain. From its inception, CWA’s activities have been based on prayer. Our motto reflects that premise: ‘Protecting the rights of the family through prayer and action.’”⁶⁵⁰ From the original nine women’s strategy session emerged the first seeds that germinated to produce CWA, which rapidly burgeoned into a nationwide movement.

The primary means for achieving this effect was first organizing a larger gathering to communicate CWA’s core message that would promulgate a ‘traditional family values’ theological creed and simultaneously necessitate political action to defend itself against ideological leanings at variance with those values. This plan was so effective that in 1978, as CWA archives reveal, “The first meeting to educate and alert Christian women on the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), led by Beverly LaHaye, occurred in San Diego, California. More than 1,200 attended. This was the springboard to beginning Concerned Women for America as a national organization.”⁶⁵¹ Subsequently in January of 1979, CWA was officially incorporated as a CLO.⁶⁵²

After this first gathering and CWA’s official incorporation, it expanded rapidly as a national, politically conservative, membership-based CLO. This was due, in part, to a well-designed national campaign that focused primarily on LaHaye’s central message of preempting what she identified as a hostile takeover by “social forces that threatened to destroy our families and our nation.”⁶⁵³ This kind of rhetoric strongly resonated amongst her supporters as she buttressed her family values assertions with a forecasted injurious social upheaval consequential to a ratification of the ERA. Specifically, LaHaye argued that if the ERA were to become law this would result in a “complete integration of the sexes.”⁶⁵⁴ In her opinion, this was a particular cause for alarm because it could eventually upend long-established societal behavioral norms for the sexes. For example, the organization’s legal interpretation of the ERA’s probable impact concluded that “there be no segregation of the sexes in prisons, reform schools, public restrooms, and other public facilities.”⁶⁵⁵ Additionally, CWA argued that a larger societal embrace of homosexuality, compulsory engagement of women in excursions of war, and the termination of legally mandated support for wives and children on the part of husbands would result from the ERA’s effectuation.⁶⁵⁶ These

points provided the sinews for a movement that emphasized a shattering of traditional family structures, if the ERA was not curtailed.

This kind of messaging is of particular significance because it illustrates how CWA's communication strategy served to effectively aggregate its initial membership base. Marshall offers keen insight into how that organization and similar groups of that era shaped the public discourse by "recast[ing] the conflict from the abstract principles of equal rights to the defense of the traditional family, the homemaker role, and the protection of women from exploitation in the public sphere."⁶⁵⁷ The significance of this strategy cannot be overstated, particularly considering CWA's principal aim of defeating, in their opponents opinion, an overtly just and innocuous policy.

The challenge of contesting it based solely on arguing against its actual tenets and not its speculated impact was a more formidable task. Instead, as is evident, the decision was pursued to elicit concern amongst conservative elements that inculcated grave concern in many people's hearts and minds that their values, principles, and way of life were endangered. This impelled many individuals to embrace CWA's defensive lobbying strategy that sought to preserve such beliefs, terminate the ERA, and stop, in their opinion, an oppositional and nefarious leadership that was clearly gaining sizeable national influence and control. The assertion that the ERA was a legislative shroud hiding the insidious undertaking of antagonistic forces that, if uncovered, would reveal a liberal—or, at minimum, "anti-Christian"—agenda was enough to attract numerous members to join CWA's ranks to "stand for righteousness against the oncoming darkness," as LeHaye declares.⁶⁵⁸

Consequently, in the years to follow, what ensued was a national lobbying strategy incorporating the aforementioned messaging, with a particular focus on building grass roots support within states that were vital to counteracting the ERA's ratification. In 1981 this lobbying strategy was in full swing and took the form of a broader communications campaign to influence voters via television broadcasts in states where the ERA was still under consideration for ratification.⁶⁵⁹ "The fight against the ERA," as CWA's records affirm, "continued across the states. In Illinois, CWA produced four 30-second TV spots that aired 246 times in the state before the ERA vote was taken. CWA's budget was \$40,000, compared to the National Organization for Women's budget of \$2 million. Still, the ERA was defeated."⁶⁶⁰ Beyond successfully defeating the ERA in Illinois with a well-orchestrated grass roots campaign, the organization's visibility was tremendously bolstered. By the end of 1981, "CWA's

membership reached 100,000.”⁶⁶¹ Therefore, obstructing the passage of ERA, in CWA’s opinion, constituted a victory on two fronts: 1) the defeat against those forces adversarial to their Christian worldview; and 2) the exponential growth of its national grass roots network.

Since its founding, CWA has increased fivefold over the last four decades establishing itself as a veritable lobbying force throughout the United States. This CLO now claims to have over “500,000 members across the country.”⁶⁶² CWA is still recognized on Capitol Hill for its enduring legacy in supporting conservative political policies, its federal and state lobbying structures, and its broad national influence. All in all, its vast grass roots network serves to undergird its direct lobbying effort on Capitol Hill and State Capitols around the nation. Moreover, in relation to the broad range of lobbying entities—secular or Christian—its current President, Penny Young Nance, touts it as being “the nation’s largest public policy women’s organization.”⁶⁶³

Despite the designation of “Women” in its title, over the years CWA’s sizeable membership has included both women and men of various ages and denominational backgrounds. Also included within this number is a small contingent of people of faith traditions outside of Christianity.⁶⁶⁴ In part, what has attracted this ample following to CWA is its theologically interpreted policy formulations that buttress its somewhat oblique organizational mission statement, which declares, “Concerned Women for America protects and promotes Biblical values and Constitutional principles through prayer, education, and advocacy.”⁶⁶⁵ Further examination of CWA’s issues agenda clarifies how this unique theological/political hermeneutical approach determines policies that best fit the organization’s understanding of “Biblical values and Constitutional principles.”⁶⁶⁶

Accordingly, CWA emphasizes seven distinct issue areas, as mentioned in the foregoing chapter: “Sanctity of Life, Defense of the Family, Education, Religious Liberty, National Sovereignty, Sexual Exploitation, and Support for Israel.”⁶⁶⁷ Similar to other family values CLOs, issues surrounding human sexuality and reproduction are key areas of concern. Specifically in regards to “Sanctity of Life,” the organization advocates for any legislation that “supports the protection of all innocent human life from conception until natural death.”⁶⁶⁸ CWA also “support[s] alternatives to abortion and healing for mothers suffering from the results of abortion.”⁶⁶⁹ This stated viewpoint translates into lobbying chiefly for pro-life policies on both the federal and state levels.

However, this issue area is more comprehensive than abortion alone. As Kenda Bartlett, CWA's current Executive Director, shares, "The life issue has... so many different aspects... When I got involved in CWA, 30 plus years ago, when you talked about the life issue everybody understood that it meant the abortion issue. [Today] we're dealing with chemical abortions. We're talking about RU486. We're talking about the end-of-life issues that have come about because of our devaluing of life."⁶⁷⁰ Understandably, this significantly expands the scope of the life issue, with additional matters like euthanasia, human cloning, and stem cell research all falling under this broader theme; all of which carry a particular weight as key policy areas for CWA.⁶⁷¹

Additionally, regarding the broader theme of human sexuality, the issue areas of "Defense of the Family" and "Sexual Exploitation" are germane. First, as it relates to the latter category, CWA asserts that it "endeavors to fight all pornography, obscenity, prostitution, and sex slavery."⁶⁷² Bartlett details the historical path that resulted in the organization's adoption of this issue area: "When CWA started, pornography was one of our core issues; and by pornography, we dealt mainly with local ordinances as to where adult clubs could be, where adult bookstores could be. And now of course with the expansion of the pornography issue, we've changed even the title of it to 'Sexual Exploitation' because trafficking has become such a huge issue."⁶⁷³ CWA's lobbying efforts directed toward ending human trafficking, in particular, create an obvious link with other family-value CLOs, as well as social justice-oriented CLOs that seek justice for exploited and marginalized members of society. However, the issue area titled, "Defense of the Family," primarily shares similar characteristics with those of other previously investigated family values-oriented CLOs. Publicly, the organization asserts, "CWA believes that marriage consists of one man and one woman."⁶⁷⁴ Furthermore, it advances that it "seek[s] to protect and support the Biblical design of marriage and the gift of children."⁶⁷⁵ In light of such views, any and all policies—on both the state and federal levels—that seek to define marriage beyond the stated manner, or aim to legalize same-sex unions, are adamantly opposed by CWA.

Closely linked to the reviewed issue areas is lobbying directed toward ensuring "Religious Liberty". This is another important component to CWA's advocacy, as it affirms that it "supports the God-given rights of individuals in the United States and other nations to pray, worship, and express their beliefs without fear of discrimination or persecution."⁶⁷⁶ Particularly for CWA, there is a strong correlation between lobbying for religious liberty as the right to publicly express one's religious opinions on human

sexuality and reproduction, and advocating for policies that afford him or her to publicly live out those religious convictions without governmental interference, or fear of legal reprisal concerning such adherence. This tendency is, again, similar to the majority of family value-oriented CLOs. Legislation that ensures the protection of conscientious objectors in healthcare is a concrete example of policies supported by CWA under this category. CWA espouses that it is adamantly opposed to physicians or other healthcare workers “being forced out of positions or reprimanded for declining to participate in abortions.”⁶⁷⁷ They believe religious liberty statutes afford one the right to do so and must be safeguarded at all costs.

The 2014 Supreme Court case of *Burrell v. Hobby Lobby Inc.*⁶⁷⁸ provides a recent illustration of CWA’s lobbying efforts aimed to protect one’s religious liberty to conscientiously object to laws that are in direct opposition to their religious conviction—and just so happens to focus on issues of human sexuality or reproduction. In this case, CWA actively lobbied the Supreme Court to allow corporations to deny certain reproductive health mandates to its employees that are sanctioned by law; specifically in the situations when the owners of such corporations find those mandates to be at odds with their religious beliefs. In short, the following excerpt from official court documents details what prompted legal action:

“In these cases, the owners of three closely held for-profit corporations have sincere Christian beliefs that life begins at conception and that it would violate their religion to facilitate access to contraceptive drugs or devices that operate after that point. In separate actions, they sued HHS and other federal officials and agencies (collectively HHS) under RFRA and the Free Exercise Clause, seeking to enjoin application of the contraceptive mandate insofar as it requires them to provide health coverage for the four objectionable contraceptives.”⁶⁷⁹⁶⁸⁰

In support of the owners’ claim, CWA legal counsel submitted an amicus brief to the Supreme Court for review with the intent to impact the court’s final decision. “Our legal counsel often gets involved in the process,” Hannah Wegmann of CWA advises, “and he’s written many amicus briefs on different court cases, and recently we were able to witness a win, if you will, at the Supreme Court in the Hobby Lobby case.” Concerning that final decision to which Wegmann alludes, Adam Liptak of the *Washington Post* reports in a June 13, 2014 article, the following on the outcome: “The Supreme Court ruled on Monday that requiring family-owned corporations to pay for insurance coverage for contraception under the Affordable Care Act violated a federal law protecting religious freedom. It was, a dissent said, ‘a decision of startling breadth.’”⁶⁸¹

As a consequence, the corporation's legal victory also proved to be a favorable result for CWA, as its lobbying efforts contributed to the win and achieved its primary objective of protecting the religious liberty of these conscientious objectors.

Next in line for consideration among CWA's main policy areas "Education." In principle, CWA rejects all educational policies that promote and embrace what it terms, "Godless philosophies, and, in particular, the unbalanced presentation of America's founding, of evolution and of sex education."⁶⁸² It also seeks to achieve two broad education policy objectives: "1. The quality of education restored to a level of excellence in academic achievement without governmental mandates that are detrimental to parental rights. 2. School choice options available to parents that will benefit all children."⁶⁸³

For CWA's recent lobbying work, these positions essentially translate into advocacy against federal control of states' educational curriculums, like the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which have been adopted by over forty U.S. states.⁶⁸⁴ CWA argues, "With such a diverse population in the United States, local control of education is best, whereby parents, teachers and taxpayers have a voice. Because the states must agree to adopt the CCSS verbatim, there is now no local recourse if the standards prove to be a failure. Under Common Core, states have sacrificed their sovereignty and local control and have been reduced to mere administrative agents."⁶⁸⁵ CWA asserts that the flexibility to determine, on a local level, what subjects, content, or skills students should learn—and determine the pedagogical method in which they should learn them—is the best way for parents to influence their children's educational process. As a result, the organization maintains, children would be afforded the academic and moral basis most in consonance with their parents' values, faith, visions, and opinions. As such, CWA supports public policies that seek to achieve those specific aims.

The last two policy areas for brief consideration are "National Sovereignty" and "Support for Israel." Foreign policy implications create a singular commonality between these two areas. Regarding "National Sovereignty," "CWA believes that neither the United Nations nor any other international organization should have authority over the United States in any area." In this instance, the organization upholds and promulgates an unapologetic nationalism, maintaining that "...the United States has the right and duty to protect and secure our national borders."⁶⁸⁶ Furthermore, CWA advocates for "budget restraint which embodies responsible spending, small

government and a budget in which the U.S. government spends within its means...”⁶⁸⁷ This further translates into policies that ensure a stalwart defense, border controls to protect against unauthorized immigration, and a reduction in national spending considered wasteful.⁶⁸⁸ Each are key focus areas for CWA’s lobbying efforts within this categorization.

Lastly, “Support of Israel” is an area that seeks a foreign policy effect that grants a special and privileged status to the modern state of Israel amongst U.S. allies. For CWA, this unique status should manifest itself in a resolute commitment by the U.S. government to providing economic, military, and moral support to Israel. This policy position springs from CWA’s biblical hermeneutic that conjoins the Israelites of the scriptures with that of the modern Jewish state and its people; as such, they view the people of the Jewish state today as being the cultural and spiritual descendants of the prior. Indicative of their interpretative deduction about the modern state of Israel, the organization publicly confesses, “CWA believes that the people and nations who stand with Israel and the Jewish people will be blessed by God. We believe that any foreign policy effort to withdraw U.S. support for Israel is in direct contradiction to America’s national interests.”⁶⁸⁹ Consequently, CWA actively lobbies on the “discontinuation of millions of U.S. government dollars sent to nations who support terrorism... [And for] laws and policies that strengthen the ties between Israel and the U.S. Policies enacted by our State Department, Department of Defense and others that encourage the development of our relationship with Israel.”⁶⁹⁰ The impact of their lobbying efforts, in conjunction with other pro-Israel lobbying groups, contribute to the state of Israel remaining atop the list of principal recipients of U.S. foreign aid. As a matter of fact, in FY 2016, the Obama Administration budget request to Congress allocated a whopping \$3.10 billion in foreign aid to Israel.⁶⁹¹ This kind of sizeable assistance is precisely what CWA lobbying efforts aim to achieve under this category.

The seven distinct issue areas outlined provide a broad framework to guide CWA’s overall lobbying activities. In practical terms, this entails drafting, analyzing, supporting, or contesting policies proposals in circulation at either the state or federal levels. Due to CWA’s vast national grass-roots network, and the sheer number of policies or bills that the organization can pursue in Congress or state houses, its organizational structure requires that all policy decisions are “set at the National office.”⁶⁹² The National Office is actively monitoring the legislative activity in Washington and initiates lobbying activity as determined by its organizational

leadership. As Bartlett shares, “if there’s something, a new piece of legislation that we haven’t looked at before she [policy analyst] and myself [Executive Director] and our Legislative Chief of Staff, and our President and CEO, we all sit down and talk through it, and we determine what our stand on the issue is going to be.”⁶⁹³ Certainly, however, there are instances when policies or legislation emanate from CWA’s grass roots network. In such instances, the details of the policy or legislation are submitted to the National Office for official review. On this theme, Bartlett, referring to CWA’s grass roots membership, further reveals, “They have a form that they fill out saying we would like to support this piece of legislation or we want to oppose it. We here at the National Office look at it, and we say, first of all, yes this falls within our core issues. And, secondly, this is an issue that we do want to get involved in, and you are then approved to support it or oppose it.”⁶⁹⁴ She adds, “So we keep a pretty tight rein on what we do and what we allow our state organizations to do because we want to be sure we are staying within our core issues...”⁶⁹⁵

As stated above, central to CWA’s success in moving Congress and state legislatures is its foremost grass roots’ organizing unit, “Prayer Action Chapters.”⁶⁹⁶ The idea of organizing women into prayer groups that would also engage in lobbying was first conceived by LaHaye at the organization’s inception. To-date, its Prayer Action Chapters remain central tactic to ensuring their efforts attain success. “Mrs. LaHaye,” Bartlett shares, “from the very beginning knew that... as women, we like to be part of a group. We like to be part of something. So she, and the ladies that worked with her on this, came up with the idea of our basic grass roots organization, which... is called a Prayer Action Chapter.”⁶⁹⁷ For women who are sympathetic to CWA’s cause, but do not have time to attend chapter meetings, the concept of “Home Teams” was developed.⁶⁹⁸ Bartlett details how such teams function: “We have Home Team captains across the country. These are women who have said, ‘I love what CWA does. I know how important it is to pray about these issues. I know how important it is for us to do something in response to those issues, but I don’t have the time to go to another meeting. But if you will send the information, I will read it. I will pray. I will do the action item you asked me to do, and I will pass that information onto my Home Team.”⁶⁹⁹ An additional political organizing strategy was envisioned and implemented by CWA to reach a younger demographic, entitled, “Young Women for America (YWA).”⁷⁰⁰ “YWA,” as CWA’s records disclose, “is a student-led initiative that is geared toward high school and college campuses to bring active groups of like-minded

women together to promote conservative values to their schools and the nation. The mission of YWA is to train the next generation to protect and promote Biblical values and Constitutional principles through prayer, education, and advocacy.”⁷⁰¹

To build strong enduring relational connections between individual legislators and CWA’s vast grass roots network, the “Encourage a Legislator Program” was instituted.⁷⁰² This program entails sending various forms of communication to lawmakers to inform them of CWA’s moral and spiritual support, and as Bartlett advises, “is just for encouragement.” Though policy requests or demands are normally excluded from this kind of contact, these efforts are certainly first steps in a strategic lobbying effort to build trust between CWA and policymakers. Direct lobbying meetings are often scheduled to further strengthen the relational ties, specifically with the aim of presenting policy suggestions for the legislator’s consideration. Bartlett further divulges, “We also have our state legislative people, and our state directors who are down there meeting these people [legislators] face to face, introducing them to CWA, establishing credibility our credibility as an organization, establishing the credibility of the information that we give them, and then they become our friends in a lot of cases. They will... know they can depend upon us to give them good information, if they need information.”⁷⁰³ This type of direct engagement with legislators is what CWA hopes will develop into a normalized relationship where information transmission could regularly occur to achieve its lobbying objectives.

Lastly, to fund these programs, in 2015, CWA’s organizational expenditures totaled \$4,078,589.00.⁷⁰⁴ The key programs reviewed constitute the core structural units within CWA that provide it with the massive grass roots support it has built to achieve the abovementioned legislative victories of the past.

***A History of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Lobbying Offices:
A Roman Catholic Perspective***

As highlighted in the preceding chapters, the lobbying arm of the Roman Catholic Church is one of the earliest founded institutions amongst all CLOs that are currently operational in Washington, D.C. In fact, the Catholic Church has maintained a permanent organizational lobbying presence as a church-based CLO on Capitol Hill for at least a century. To quickly review its early history, in 1917 the National Catholic War Council was originally established as a means for Catholics to support U.S. efforts

during the First World War. By 1919, after that conflict ended, the National Catholic War Council was restructured and its mission and title changed to reflect the contextual conditions of that era. At this juncture, it was renamed the National Catholic Welfare Council, and as Dr. Stephen Colecchi, the current director of the USCCB's Office of International Peace and Justice (IJP), shares, the organization's emphasis shifted from its original intent to focusing primarily on "social reconstruction."⁷⁰⁵ He further clarifies the reason behind the bishops' initiating this organizational change at that time:

"[In] 1917, the bishops formed this National Catholic War Council and then in 1919 Pope Benedict XV at the time urged bishops of the world to work for peace and justice. And so in response, the bishops reorganized themselves from being the National Catholic War Council in 1919 to become the National Catholic Welfare Council. And then they set up a general secretariat here in Washington, D.C. So in 1919, was when the office was established here. They had some staff that were engaged and they eventually change the name from Welfare Council to the National Catholic Welfare Conference to make it clear that [they] weren't a deliberative body but were speaking jointly as bishops. Then so in 1922, the National Catholic Welfare Conference was kind of born and they dealt with education issues, immigration issues, [and] social action issues."⁷⁰⁶

With the First World War past, and in light of the aforementioned mandate from the Vatican for bishops to pursue peace and justice, the shifting socio-political realities within the United States prompted the Roman Catholic Church's hierarchy to reorganize its burgeoning lobbying organization so as to solidify its perpetuity. Altering its mission within the new national context did just that. Undoubtedly, such steps pointed to the church leadership's confidence in its lobbying organization as an instrument conducive to achieving the Pope's orders and advantageous to enhancing the church's overall mission. Thus, its continuance was determined as imperative, and took shape in the form of the work of the National Catholic Welfare Council.

As church archival records affirm, "Early on it fought against federal aid to education bills for fear such laws would impose government controls on private schools though later it would fight for funding for parochial schools. The NCWC would also serve as the forum for bishops to discuss common problems and the mechanism to issue their pastoral letters and judgments on critical issues of the day such as birth control, communism, fascism, poverty, and race relations."⁷⁰⁷ Educational policy was of noteworthy import for the NWCW early on, as it sought to safeguard and strengthen its vast network of Catholic Schools throughout the country. Other public policy concerns

on their legislative agenda in those initial years, however, appear more altruistic in nature.

The basic organizational structure of the NCWC remained consistent until the mid-1960s. “Following the Vatican II Council,” however, “the bishops reorganized the NCWC in 1966, transforming it into the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and its standing secretariat, the United States Catholic Conference (USCC).”⁷⁰⁸ Colecchi, reflecting on the details surrounding this history, points to a fundamental intent behind the subsequent reorganization. “In [19]66,” he shares, “they divided the organization into two organizations: The National Conference of Catholic Bishops, on the one hand, and the National United States Catholic Conference, on the other. The United States Catholic Conference did the lobbying and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops did the internal life of church.”⁷⁰⁹ This reconfiguring on the part of the Catholic Church’s leadership was done as a way to implement central mandates that came out of decisions made during Vatican II. “One of the principal reforms of Vatican II,” Colecchi says, “was that the Catholic Church in each country of sufficient size should organize itself as a national conference of bishops.”⁷¹⁰ Consequently, in order to realize this directive, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops came into being, whose organizational mandate was to support the bishops’ pastoral duties within the church at-large; while the United States Catholic Conference focused on influencing Congress and more public matters generally. Still, both organizations remained under the bishops’ authority and control. Thirty-five years later, the embrace of this type of divided organizational structure would come to an end. Ultimately, as Colecchi reveals, “[The bishops] decided they really didn’t need two separate bodies so they brought them back together in 2001 to form the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.”⁷¹¹

Today, the main office that directs the USCCB’s lobbying activities is the Office of Governmental Relations (OGR). However, within the OGR, there are multiple departments established to pursue a range of domestic and international policies. These departments are demarcated according to the seven public policy issues of concern: “Pro-Life, Religious Liberty, Marriage and Family, Catholic Education, Domestic Social Development, International Justice and Peace, and Migration and Refugees, and Communications.”⁷¹² The Pro-Life, Religious Liberty, and Marriage and Family departments reflect similar policy designs as those of CLOs that fall under the general categorization of family values-oriented groups as previously reviewed.

At this point, it is essential to expound on the functions of the additional departmental divisions within the OGR. Starting with the aims of the Communications department, “[It] is committed to ensuring a religious presence in mass communications, removing barriers to communication, preserving the public’s access to information, and the right to freedom of speech for everyone.”⁷¹³ Its lobbying efforts focus mainly on “eliminating the presence of pornography and violence in the media, with special emphasis on protecting children, along with providing higher quality programming, providing Catholic information and educational programming, and promoting diversity in ownership of communications outlets.”⁷¹⁴ Next, the Catholic Education department’s key function is tracking “all federal legislation relating to elementary and secondary education.”⁷¹⁵ Its lobbying efforts are instrumental in securing favorable legislation that protects and advances the interests of Catholic educational institutions nationwide. The Domestic Social Development department “works to apply Catholic social teaching to domestic issues in the public policy arena. Under the leadership of the Domestic Policy Committee of the Conference of Bishops, the USCCB advocates on behalf of poor and vulnerable people on a wide range of legislative matters to promote family and child-friendly policies, access to health care, the preservation of rural life, the reformation of welfare policies, and the consideration of issues of poverty.”⁷¹⁶ As apparent, this department’s activities are mostly in alignment with other CLOs categorized among the social justice-oriented groups reviewed above.

The Migration and Refugees department also falls within the social justice-oriented grouping, as “[it] works to ensure that persons fleeing persecution and other refugee-like situations have special standing and consideration and that family reunification remains the just basis for...immigration policy.”⁷¹⁷ Moreover, this department lobbies for “legislation that would make comprehensive reforms in the nation’s immigration laws, including increased opportunities for immigrants to legally enter or remain in the United States and an opportunity for undocumented immigrants who are in the United States to legalize their status.”⁷¹⁸ In fact, the Migration and Refugee department is one of the largest departments at the USCCB, as the Catholic Church’s refugee resettlement program is one of the largest in the country. Regarding this sizeable undertaking, the USCCB publicizes that, “In partnership with its affiliates, and the United States Department of State/Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, USCCB/MRS resettles approximately 30% of the refugees that arrive in the

U.S. each year.”⁷¹⁹ To support this tremendous endeavor, the Roman Catholic Church is one of the largest United States government grant recipients in this area. In 2016, for example, the USCCB’s operating expenses for migration and refugee services totaled \$96,073,760.00, of which the United States government granted the vast majority.⁷²⁰

Lastly, the Office for International Justice and Peace (IJP) within the OGR functions primarily to “support public policies which promote human rights and religious freedom globally; encourage international assistance, peace and disarmament; and reduce and resolve violent conflicts.”⁷²¹ The IJP “also strive[s] to reduce global poverty through effective international assistance, debt relief for the poorest nations, and just trade policies.”⁷²² This department’s principal focus is to influence U.S. foreign policy in such a way that the principles of fairness and justice are also considered in foreign policy debates, which are mostly dominated by economic and geo-political interests. Additionally, the transglobal nature and influence of the Catholic Church affords the IJP a unique role in influencing U.S. foreign policy, as the larger institution’s reach is present in locations where U.S. governmental engagement may in fact be absent.

As is evident at this point, the USCCB’s OGR lobbies on a broad range of public policy issues. To fund much of this activity, in 2016, the USCCB budgeted a total of \$17,486,537.00 for communications, policy and advocacy activities to influence Congress.⁷²³ This vast sum of money primarily reflects the costs necessary to support both its direct and grass roots lobbying activities.

Each department within the OGR, indubitably, has an extensive portfolio of historical data that can provide excellent qualitative input to highlight its lobbying activities throughout the time of the organization’s founding. A study dedicated solely to investigating the USCCB’s efforts on Capitol Hill alone could not exhaust all these findings. Nevertheless, to focus this current study and overcome the challenge of selecting suitable lobbying illustrations from an extensive array of noteworthy material, only those lobbying actions conducted by the IJP within the last forty years will be examined to support a better understanding of the nature and impact of the OGR’s efforts in influencing public policy. This, admittedly, limits this study’s scope and invites further research by scholars who are interested in writing a more comprehensive history of the USCCB’s activities in Washington, D.C.

With the stated parameters in mind, the concurrent grass roots and direct lobbying efforts of the IJP beginning in 1985 will be considered. That year, the IJP was

in the midst of leadership change, and a recruitment process was underway to staff the vacant post of Foreign Affairs Advisor for Africa. Ambassador Robert T. Hennemeyer was targeted and recruited by the USCC as a leading candidate for the position. His name came to the attention of OGR's leadership because a former colleague of his at the State Department, Ed Dougherty (who was employed at USCC at the time), recommended him for consideration. This was unbeknownst to Hennemeyer at the time. It was Dougherty who later personally reached out to his former colleague to determine his level of interest in the open post.

At the time of the inquiry, Hennemeyer was serving in his second year as U.S. ambassador to the Gambia, with over three decades of experience in the Foreign Service. However, he was also contemplating a vocational change in the near future and was ready to transition out of the Foreign Service. So, this opportunity came at just the right time, as it coincided, not only with his desire for change, but also with his overall interests, experience, and commitment to the Catholic faith. In the end, Ambassador Hennemeyer pursued the opportunity and was hired as the Foreign Advisor for Africa in the IJP department at the USCC. However, he did not remain in that post long. Detailing his early days at the USCC, Hennemeyer shares, "My job unexpectedly changed after only a few months when I was asked to be director of the Office for International Justice and Peace (IJP)."⁷²⁴

During his early tenure as director, he further explains, "IJP was one of two offices making up the Department of Social Development and World Peace. The other dealt with domestic issues."⁷²⁵ Consequently, a considerable amount of IJP's work during that time, specifically under his directorate, was "focused on disarmament, development aid, human rights, and religious freedom."⁷²⁶ IJP's advocacy in these areas centered on policies that clearly promoted justice and effectuated outcomes that were often humanitarian in scope. As such, the Christian tenets of mercy, compassion, and charity were realized in public policies lobbied for by this ecclesiastical body.

In terms of specific international policies concerns, "nuclear disarmament, Vietnam, East Timor, El Salvador, Chile, Nicaragua, Cuba, China, and South Africa"⁷²⁷ were all priority areas determined by the bishops. As it is now, so it was then under Hennemeyer that the IJP "was supervised by the Committee for International Justice and Peace."⁷²⁸ This committee includes several bishops who maintain tight controls over all policy choices pursued by the IJP. Sharing how decisions are officially reached, Hennemeyer reveals, "We did not issue a statement or pursue a major issue without the

green light from the bishops. While frequently we would take a fairly progressive position, it was one that Bishops wanted us to take.”⁷²⁹

It is essential to note that Hennemeyer’s new assignment at the USCC commenced in the broader context of the Cold War, with the United States and the Soviet Union as the two sole superpowers of that era vying for global dominance. In that global context, the Roman Catholic Church, a supranational global force with proclivities toward the West, expressly sought to influence U.S. foreign policy positions that would tangibly affect the Catholic Church’s conditions in communist countries where any such policies were directed. This is particularly evident in certain policy positions adopted by the IJP in relation to Vietnam. Under Hennemeyer’s leadership, the IJP lobbied for normalization of relations between the United States and Vietnam at the behest of the bishops—a very controversial position at the time. In reviewing the history that led to the bishop’s adoption of this policy stance, Hennemeyer shares,

“In 1988, the USCCB received word from the Vatican that the Vietnamese bishops were under great pressure from their communist government and hoped that the U.S. bishops could assist. I was asked to go to Ho Chi Minh City (Saigon) to attend a conference of Catholic aid organizations, but more importantly to try to discover what the Vietnamese bishops wanted us to do. During a week of meetings, I managed to arrange an appointment with Archbishop Binh of Saigon. Like a scene from a spy movie, my guide took me via pedi-cab to a restaurant where we exited out the back door into another pedi-cab and on to the archbishop’s office. After an exchange of pleasantries, I started to explain my mission. The archbishop put his finger to his lips and suggested we visit his garden. He then explained that his priest-secretary was a government spy. During our garden conversation, he said the most useful thing the U.S. bishops could do would be to push for the normalization of political and economic relations with Vietnam, as it was his view that this would bring both liberalization and economic improvement. Back at the USCCB, we developed a statement calling for normalization of relations in a step-by-step process, each conditioned by performance. We planned to present this statement to the USCCB annual meeting for approval by the bishops.”⁷³⁰

In response to his initial suggestion, Cardinal Law of Boston put his proposal on hold until a delegation of Catholic bishops could travel to Vietnam to discuss matters firsthand and in greater detail with the bishops of that country.⁷³¹ Thus, following Cardinal Law’s directive, Hennemeyer immediately began recruiting Catholic leadership to join him on such a trip. “We secured the agreement,” Hennemeyer discloses, “of Cardinal Mahoney of Los Angeles, Cardinal McCarrick of Washington, and Archbishop O’Meara of Indianapolis to join my immediate boss, the very able John

Carr, and me for a trip to Vietnam.”⁷³² This fact-finding mission, which included then-chair of the Committee of International Justice and Peace Cardinal Mahoney, was extended to include visits to multiple countries. Philippines and Korea were also stops along the journey; as Catholic Church leadership in each respective country was met by this delegation of U.S. bishops and leaders.

The principal purpose of this trip, however, remained as this group of men sought to develop a suitable foreign policy on Vietnam, as a means to support the Vietnamese Catholic leadership under fire. With that as the central focus, the delegation successfully met with both Catholic and governmental leaders in Vietnam. “Our last official stop was Hanoi,” Hennemeyer explains, “where we met with the cardinal in his decrepit palace and with senior government officials to whom we presented a list of prisoners of conscience whose release we urged. This last meeting was particularly awkward, as the bishops on our delegation were so determined to be polite and gracious to our Vietnamese interlocutors, that it fell to John Carr to raise the issue of political prisoners.”⁷³³ The delegation voiced the church’s official position on the ongoing political hostilities in Vietnam with recommendations that attempted to ease tensions endured by the Vietnamese Catholic church at the hands of the government as prerequisites to crafting an agreed upon foreign policy that would benefit Vietnam broadly by alleviating the economic strains that nation experienced at that time.

Eventually, the decision to lobby for normalization was made. However, neither knowledge of this trip, nor the forthcoming proposals on the Catholic Church’s part officially advocating that foreign policy position, were without criticism and resistance. Reflecting on the backlash he faced upon his return to United States, Hennemeyer shares, “Back at my USCCB office I found boxes filled with almost identical letters from Orange County, California, residents, mostly with Vietnamese names, opposing reconciliation and protesting our planned statement on normalization.”⁷³⁴ The consequence of this overseas journey was a firestorm of controversy. Moreover, the mounting pressure coming out of the Vietnamese community easily could have grounded to a halt the decision to lobby for normalization. However, the bishop’s resolve remained unwavering in regard to their decision. “Despite the campaign,” Hennemeyer says, “the bishops overwhelmingly approved the statement at their January 1989 meeting. Over the next several years, the U.S. and Vietnamese governments took the steps we had urged and normalization did bring a degree of

political liberalization, more freedom for the Church, and economic recovery. Maybe our work had some effect?”⁷³⁵

The latter question, raised here by Hennemeyer, is a legitimate one—precisely because understanding the complexity of influencing public policy outcomes, and then determining to what effect one’s lobbying strategies contributed to achieving any favorable results, is exceptionally difficult to quantify in most cases. Certainly, there are instances when a CLO writes legislation in conjunction with a congressional office and that legislation is enacted into law. Clearly, such moments provide verifiable evidence that can accurately determine the lobby impact of the given CLO involved. Or, policy makers and their staff may give verbal feedback to a CLO’s staff members that certain lobbying efforts on their part resulted in the adoption of a particular policy position by the legislators lobbied. This, too, is a viable means of measuring impact. In many cases, however, CLOs do not receive such feedback, nor take the former, more hands-on, approach to shaping legislation. Their approach is similar to the IJP in the foregoing example. They formulate policy positions and support legislation drafted—not directly by themselves—that, nevertheless, achieve desired policy ends without ever receiving firsthand knowledge of their impact on the process. Hence, if a group were to take credit for certain policy outcomes solely because of their lobbying activities, it would be very difficult to justify because of the immense number of voices and opinions that factor into moving legislation. With this notion lingering, Hennemeyer raises the question about the actual impact IJP’s lobbying had on bringing about normalization between Vietnam and the United States. Although difficult to prove, the fact remains that the lobbying objective of IJP was achieved in this instance with its voice playing a role, even if minimal at best.

This is one of several examples of the IJP initiating lobbying actions during Hennemeyer’s tenure that, upon close review, reveal a principal impetus behind such actions: the attainment of certain protections or rights for Catholic Church affiliates located in nations where repressive regimes were in power. Another such case is identifiable in the lobbying activities of the IJP after certain tragic events transpired in El Salvador in the autumn of 1989, which involved the assassination of several Catholic clergy. “On the morning of November 16, 1989,” as one historian journals, “an elite battalion of the Salvadoran Army entered the grounds of the Jesuit University of Central America, with orders to kill Father Ignacio Ellacuría—an outspoken critic of the Salvadoran military dictatorship—and leave no witnesses. When it was all over, the

soldiers had killed six Jesuit priests, a housekeeper and her daughter in cold blood. The Jesuits Massacre is one of most notorious crimes of El Salvador's 12-year civil war, which left over 75,000 people dead.”⁷³⁶ Once again, IJP found itself initiating its lobbying machinery to move Congress and the administration to safeguard, although not exclusively, members of the Catholic Church community in a foreign country.

On this occasion, however, IJP's foreign policy proposal differed from that on Vietnam, where normalization was pursued. This time, IJP took the opposite approach and focused on urging legislators to withdraw U.S. economic and military support from the Salvadoran government, which was clearly linked to this crime. This policy was adopted because the United States' prevailing policy at the time toward countries in Latin America, in general, was to mobilize government resources in the fight against left-leaning communist factions, mostly by supporting right-wing regimes that were often controlled by brutal dictators.⁷³⁷ Though, in the case of El Salvador, this incident occurred under the administration of its then-recently democratically elected president, Alfredo Cristiani, who was also known as the “standard-bearer of the right-wing Nationalist Republican Alliance.”⁷³⁸ In support of his and his predecessor's conservative administrations, “The United States sent military advisers to help the Salvadoran military fight its dirty war, as well as hundreds of millions of dollars in economic and military aid.”⁷³⁹ Such kinds of support to the Salvadoran government made the U.S. government liable, albeit indirectly, for the deaths of those Catholics as a result of its backing of the regime that committed such atrocities. Therefore, the bishops concluded the only just foreign policy recommendation was the complete withdrawal of economic and military aid from El Salvador. This was essential to stop or preempt any such future tragic occurrences of a similar nature.

Hennemeyer, reflecting on the role he played at the IJP in leading lobbying efforts to overturn the prevailing U.S. foreign policy toward El Salvador, recalls, “I testified on the Hill before the Latin American contingent of the House Foreign Affairs committee condemning that action and urging that the U.S. stop its military support of El Salvador because it was the army that killed the Jesuit priests.”⁷⁴⁰ This direct lobbying action by way of a congressional testimony was one step in a multifaceted campaign set in motion by the IJP with the hopes of putting the necessary pressure on the Salvadoran government to discontinue its campaign of terror. Additionally, the colossal effort required to shift this type of entrenched foreign policy directed toward El Salvador, specifically, and Latin America, generally, was certainly a formidable

challenge, as was clearly recognized by the IJP. “It took a long time,” Hennemeyer admits, “before the U.S. government really reacted but that’s an example of the kind of position that the bishops asked us to take and to bring to the attention of the authorities.”⁷⁴¹ Despite the challenge, IJP remained resolute in its lobbying efforts to discontinue U.S. economic and military support of the Salvadoran government.

In the foregoing illustration, direct lobbying was the key approach advanced by the bishops to move national decisionmakers to positive action. There are instances, correspondingly, when grass roots strategies were central in garnering Catholic support nationwide as a way of putting pressure on congress and the administration to achieve a particular foreign policy objective supported by the bishops. Following is one such example.

As in the previous examples, the historical trend of the bishops employing IJP’s services to lobby the U.S. government as a way of resolving conflicts that directly affected Catholic Church entities in areas embedded in conflict is a glaring characteristic in this case. However, what varies here is the implementation of a grass roots strategy that decidedly introduced foreign actors to an American audience with the aim of inspiring the national Catholic base, in particular, to political action.

Beginning in the late-1980s, the IJP “organized teams of Catholic priests and a Protestant minister to come to the States and make the rounds of churches in the United States to talk about the necessity for peace between the churches as a way to bring about peace in the community in Northern Ireland.”⁷⁴² The bishops saw a unified Church normally divided along denominational lines as crucial to bringing about a lasting peace in Northern Ireland. The conflict in Northern Ireland was complex and protracted, with roots stemming from years of struggle between an imperialistic England and an Irish population that was subjected to its rule. Specifically, however, during the historical period known as the *Troubles*, an upsurge in violence resulted.⁷⁴³ This period of political turmoil in Northern Ireland is often depicted as “a violent thirty-year conflict framed by a civil rights march in Londonderry on 5 October 1968 and the Good Friday Agreement on 10 April 1998.”⁷⁴⁴ Furthermore, in explaining the political turmoil certain parties argue, “At the heart of the conflict lay the constitutional status of Northern Ireland. The goal of the unionist and overwhelmingly Protestant majority was to remain part of the United Kingdom. The goal of the nationalist and republican, almost exclusively Catholic, minority was to become part of the Republic of Ireland.”⁷⁴⁵ Behind this societal schism, however, was more than just an arbitrary assertion by a

Catholic minority seeking to achieve political self-determination; just as central to the conflict was the longstanding “institutional discrimination against Catholics.”⁷⁴⁶ This sort of inequitable treatment fostered a bitter resentment amongst the Catholic population, who, in the end found themselves embroiled in this civil conflict. And the outcome was calamitous, with a death toll of more than 3,600 Catholics and Protestants.⁷⁴⁷

During this conflict, the IJP was actively engaged in finding creative solutions to address the crisis in Northern Ireland. The bishops decided that the churches, in fact, were uniquely equipped to lead in promoting a peaceful resolution. So, the IJP implemented a grass roots strategy that involved bringing the aforementioned delegation from Northern Ireland to tour the United States and share their stories with local congregations. As Hennemeyer reveals, the bishops essentially thought that such a delegation served to “educate Americans about the conflict, particularly the efforts of the churches to promote peace, justice and reconciliation.”⁷⁴⁸ What is not overtly stated is that the bishops essentially concluded if peace were to come to Northern Ireland, the U.S. government needed to exert its international influence and urge both sides involved in the conflict to take a seat at the negotiation table. If this were to happen, however, in the bishops’ opinion, the Roman Catholic Church in the United States would have to play a central role in moving the federal government to engage in a foreign policy debate that was essentially disregarded by the U.S. government up until that point. As MacGinty fittingly argues, reflecting on U.S. policy toward Northern Ireland prior to the 1990s, “Traditionally, US government interest in Northern Ireland has been minimal, which makes the level and the extent of the interest shown during the peace process of the 1990s quite remarkable.”⁷⁴⁹ In fact, it is certainly quite extraordinary, how the Catholic Church’s efforts to mobilize its grass roots constituencies in the United States and Ireland actually contributed to effecting the U.S. policy change that resulted; as it assisted in building an international coalition of likeminded partners to serve as advocates for peace and justice.

USCCB records detail the makeup of this extraordinary international coalition and the policy proposals they set forth to help bring about peace and justice in Northern Ireland. As recorded,

“In January 1994, Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic leaders in Ireland and their counterparts in the United States issued a significant joint call for strong fair employment and more investment in NI. This call, which coincides with a statutory review of NI’s fair employment

law, represents a major step forward in developing common ground across religious lines on the need for renewed and improved efforts to combat historic discrimination and to alleviate double-digit unemployment in a deeply-divided society.”⁷⁵⁰

Just as remarkable is the list of governmental and civil society leaders who embraced this call. These same records reveal it was “supported by President Bill Clinton, Prime Minister John Major, Irish Foreign Minister Dick Spring, and many labor, community and political groups. U.S. groups supporting the Call include: the Congressional Friends of Ireland, the AFL-CIO, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility, and the Irish National Caucus.”⁷⁵¹ This example demonstrates how a grass roots campaign as designed by the USCCB contributed to a larger international effort for peace with clear ramifications on foreign policy.

In the mid-1990s amid conflicts in Bosnia, the IJP employed a similar tactic. Gerard Powers, who was the director of the IJP between 1998-2004, reveals, “A big part of our job was giving voice to the Catholic Church around the world... During the Bosnia conflict I organized lots of visits from Catholic bishops and others from Bosnia, and ran them around to meet with members of Congress, people at the White House, State Department, and hold press conferences.”⁷⁵² Additionally, trips were organized by the IJP with the primary purpose of bringing U.S. Catholic bishops and leaders to nations embroiled in conflict to promote peace, as were in the cases of Bosnia and Sudan during Powers’ tenure.⁷⁵³ These were fact-finding trips designed to develop suitable policy positions that helped shape direct and grass roots campaigns back in the United States.

In addition to the IJP’s extensive work on international peace and justice, historically it has also focused a significant amount of its advocacy on eliminating global poverty by drafting and supporting policies that prove effective in achieving that end. Namely, prior to 2000, numerous anti-poverty organizations were fully engaged in the Jubilee Campaign—an international movement focused specifically on granting debt-relief to poor nations— as previously mentioned. Saddled with unmanageable debt, many poor countries found themselves entangled in a web of perpetual socio-economic hardship. Even Pope John Paul II, in recognition of the devastating negative impact of exorbitant debt of poorer nations, challenged the rich nations of the world in the following terms:

“The existence of a foreign debt which is suffocating quite a few countries of the American continent represents a complex problem... The Church in her

pastoral concern cannot ignore this difficult situation, since it touches the life of so many people... I too have frequently expressed my concern about this situation, which in some cases has become unbearable. In light of the imminent Great Jubilee of the Year 2000, and recalling the social significance that Jubilees had in the Old Testament, I wrote: "In the spirit of the book of Leviticus (25:8-12), Christians will have to raise their voice on behalf of all the poor of the world proposing the Jubilee as an appropriate time to give thought, among other things, to reducing substantially, if not cancelling outright, the international debt which seriously threatens the future of many nations."
—Pope John Paul II⁷⁵⁴

Considering the Pope's declaration, it is no surprise that the IJP was actively lobbying for policy that would grant debt relief to poor nations. Unbeknownst to many, however, as Powers reflects on IJP's activities surrounding the Jubilee campaign at that time, "a guy on my staff drafted two pieces of legislation that passed Congress on debt relief for poor countries." In this instance, the direct lobbying impact of IJP on debt-relief is clear. There is no better evidence of the effectiveness of a CLOs' lobbying impact than that of Congress actually passing legislation the organization itself drafted.

These illustrations provide only an introductory portrayal of the effect of the USCCB's lobbying efforts on U.S. policy within the timeframe specified. In these examples, most actions resulted in favorable policy outcomes correspondent with the original intentions for engaging policymakers. Certainly, this was not the case in all attempts to influence policy in its history as a permanent lobbying presence on Capitol Hill. These examples, nonetheless, provide valuable insight into the strategies and outcomes of its lobbying endeavors. Moreover, the sophistication and reach of the USCCB's lobby work as revealed is quite sophisticated in light of other CLOs' activities. This is a direct result of its supranational structure and significantly longer history of engagement on Capitol Hill.

Theological Framework for Church Lobbying: Methodological Approaches

In the earlier section that highlighted Bread's work, considerations of its theological interpretation of the Offering of Letters were briefly reviewed. That discussion attempted to portray the distinct dualism existent in that grass roots activity, which from Bread's perspective is equally of theological and political significance. To clarify, this assertion does not intend to suggest a sense of equal proportionality between the two; however, it seeks to relay the idea of an equal determination to fulfill

simultaneously a theological and political objective. In fact, in terms of proportionality, the theological import clearly transcends the political in the sense that theology precedes, inspires, and gives credence to any and all political methods of engagement. In short, this fundamental insight commonly held by CLOs (regardless of their political leanings, organizational structure, or Christian tradition) is purported by such organizations as the primary impetus behind their various lobbying activities.

Before first outlining the theological justifications for Bread's lobbying work, it is essential to state that in analyzing the theological rationalizations for CLOs' activities, several methods can be employed. For example, in the case of Bread's Offering of Letters, the theological underpinnings explored related to a specific organizational practice of stimulating grass roots participation. In other words, this strategy, which is an internal utility for Bread and is particularly advantageous to building and activating its national membership base in a given legislative campaign, distinctively possesses a theological justification. This indicates that certain CLOs' grass roots strategies, solitarily, can warrant theological inquiry. Consequently, this further infers that there are countless aspects of CLOs' institutional structures, processes, and habits—such as departmental configurations, internal policies, issues agenda, lobbying practices, etc.—that can conceivably indicate a theological justification formulated by the leadership of the CLO in question. However, to focus this study, two methods are adopted. The first approach seeks to clarify the theological justification that buttresses each of the studied CLO's engagement in lobbying as a practice. The second approach seeks to explain the theological framework that serves a primary rubric through which each organizations' policies are broadly chosen.

In terms of the first approach, all church-based and individual membership-based CLOs, even those of varying political persuasions, share one undeniable commonality: all embrace a theological claim that undergirds their engagement of governmental powers through the practice of lobbying. Although they may fundamentally differ in theological content, expression, doctrinal sources, or biblical support, all theological rationalizations conclude with the sanctioning of lobbying.

Subsequently, the second approach constitutes the origin of numerous and seemingly inexorable divisions amongst CLOs that lead them into specific political camps inspired by theological formulations that sanction certain policy choices. Additionally, in relation to this second approach, the primary objective of such an inquiry is to provide, in the case of each CLO studied, a descriptive analysis of the

articulated or inferred theological framework established to determine policy positions broadly. An investigation into all the various policy positions chosen and the requisite theological groundings advanced by each CLO for each specific policy adopted is not the author's intention. To do so would extend this work beyond acceptable limits. Instead, the primary aim is to analyze each organization's prevailing theological system, or the theoretical basis established, to arrive at specific theological outcomes that determine their policy positions.

Bread for the World's Theological Framework for Church Lobbying

Beginning with Bread's theological justification to lobby, it has already been noted that CLOs generally embrace the term 'advocacy' as a primary theological concept to describe their overall labors on Capitol Hill, while avoiding the term 'lobbying' because of the negative connotation it carries in public opinion within the United States. Additionally, it has already been noted, for many CLOs advocacy signifies a divine significance inextricably linked to the political method of lobbying. In Bread's case, it is its theology of 'hunger advocacy' that fully legitimizes the political practice of lobbying as a worthwhile means for Christians to create socio-political change for the most vulnerable and oppressed members of society.

Bread's theology of hunger advocacy is rooted in a biblical interpretation that appropriates various scriptural passages found in both the Old and New Testaments into a systematic expression centered on themes that clarify its broader view of advocacy itself. Subsequently, in total, there are nine major theological formulations that seek to explain and authenticate Bread's understanding of hunger advocacy, quoted as follows:

- “1) God loves us. Jesus' greatest commandments are that we love God and each other.
- 2) Humankind was created out of God's love and in God's image, so we are to respect the dignity of every person.
- 3) God has a special concern for poor and vulnerable people.
- 4) God provides out of God's abundance.
- 5) All creation is reconciled with God through Jesus Christ, and we are to be agents of reconciliation.
- 6) God loves justice and requires us to love justice and do kindness.
- 7) Jesus said, 'Whatever you do for the least of these you do for me.' We do Christ's work when we act with and for hungry and poor people.
- 8) We hear God's voice in Scripture and respond with the faithful use of our own voice.

9) God has a role for government to play in the protection and development of people.”⁷⁵⁵

These nine major theological motifs, and their corresponding clarifications, merge the method and mission by jointly sanctioning lobbying—or the more favored term, ‘advocacy’—as a legitimate expression of Christian witness with that of a theological framework that specifically supports the pursuit of all policies that aim to eradicate hunger and poverty, and promote justice generally. Upon closer examination, the specific themes of eight and nine—which emphasize certain biblical illustrations that depict both the use of one’s voice on behalf of marginalized victims within society, and then the role of government in safeguarding and cultivating all members, respectively—provide the core theological input central to Bread’s assertion that Christian advocacy through the means of lobbying is a valid ecclesiastical expression.

Furthermore, numerous passages are offered by Bread as the biblical support for its hunger advocacy. “Every section of the Bible,” Beckmann contends, “is clear about our obligation to poor people and about the political dimension of justice for poor people.”⁷⁵⁶ Commencing with the Hebrew Scriptures, he advances, “The primary revelation of God in the Old Testament is the exodus from Egypt. Moses’ message was political and radical: ‘Let the slaves go!’”⁷⁵⁷ Expressly for individuals of the Christian faith, Bread’s interpretation of Exodus chapters 1-15 reasons to formulate Moses’s role as exemplary and worth imitation, specifically in terms of his public confrontation of governing authority in the attainment of socio-political liberation of the Hebrews. In Bread’s final estimation, Moses provides a suitable biblical archetype for modern-day Christian advocacy/lobbying on Capitol Hill. As Moses used his voice and confronted Pharaoh about liberating the Hebrew slaves, Bread claims modern-day hunger advocates are called to embrace a similar divine directive and use their voices to call national decisionmakers to account in pursuing justice for poor and hungry people.

This theological construct dually focuses on the role and relationship between human instruments divinely inspired and appointed by Jehovah to influence socio-political transformation by vocally challenging unjust governing authorities while providing a framework to pursue policies that aim to abolish such oppressive systems. Recognizably, Bread does not call for comprehensive political self-determination for poor and hungry people as was resultant for the Hebrews in the Exodus story. However, Bread adopts relevant exegetical points as stated by contextualizing their practical

application to the democratic political order within the United States. The primary point here is the theological justification for Christians to use their voices to help liberate poor and hunger people by confronting lawmakers who can set the “oppressed free.”

To portray a fuller picture of Bread’s espousal of the role of Christian vocal engagement to achieve divinely ordained purposes, organizational theological communiques emphasize the prophetic office as a principal example, particularly as identified by the texts of prophets in the pre-exilic period. Namely, Bread references Amos and Jeremiah as prophets who “spoke to those in authority.”⁷⁵⁸ Essentially, they are viewed as model-types of advocates, faithful in service to a divine charge to speak the truth of Jehovah to the powerful. This is evidential as each is recorded within the biblical writ as calling the nations of Israel and Judah, especially their leadership, to account for their idolatry, injustices, and unfaithfulness to the commandments of God.

Furthermore, Bread underscores the fact that the New Testament is replete with illustrations where the exercise of voice is evinced as a faithful expression in service to God. Bread sees evidence of this in the Gospel narratives that highlight Jesus’ and John the Baptist’ verbal confrontations with the religio-political establishment of their day, as both verbally exposed the hypocritical and exploitative nature of the leadership in governance while also calling for a form of repentance. This was made manifest in the spiritual transformation that effecting spiritual, social, and political conditions of the nation. Perceptibly, this type of faithful use of voice on their part instigated a political agitation that ultimately factored into each of their executions at the hands of the state. Nonetheless, from Bread’s perspective, Jesus, John, and the pre-exilic prophets mentioned above, provide substantial biblical support for this specific type of advocacy directed at challenging governmental injustices by people of the Christian faith.

Moreover, in Bread’s theological formulation of hunger advocacy broadly, a theology of government is advanced as a pertinent and essential sub-theme. Reflecting on the role of government, Bread posits, “Old Testament law established a structure for society with deep, divine concern for poor people and disapproval of systems that keep or make people poor.”⁷⁵⁹ In other words, Bread contends that an essential function of government is to ensure laws are instituted that provide for the welfare of the economically poor members of society, while simultaneously facilitating conditions that allow for upward socio-economic mobility. This theological position is in complete consonance with Catholic social teaching—particularly that which argues for a preferential option for the poor.

Fundamentally, the preferential option for the poor is the implied theological rubric through which Bread makes all policy decisions, as expressly articulated in its third theological motif for advocacy: “God has a special concern for poor and vulnerable people.” Bread offers biblical support for this position, emphasizing that “The Scriptures portray the Lord as upholding the cause of those who are oppressed and providing for hungry and poor people (Psalm 146:5-9; Psalm 72; Proverbs 22).”⁷⁶⁰ Bread further espouses, “Jesus came into the world in humble circumstances (Luke 2:7). Fulfilling the prophecies of Isaiah, he preached good news to poor people—proclaiming freedom for prisoners, sight for the blind, and the release of the oppressed (Isaiah 61:1-2; Matthew 11:2-6; Luke 4:18-21).”⁷⁶¹ This interpretation assumes a certain fundamentalist dimension which does not seek to allegorize the specified biblical texts; instead, the deeper spiritual meaning is found and achieved in the literal interpretation and personal modeling of the principles expressed in such passages by Christian advocates.

In Bread’s case, furthermore, charity to help poor and hungry people is often juxtaposed with the phrase that “the government has to do its part.”⁷⁶² Charity as understood by Bread, is simply incapable of rectifying the root cause of any systemic injustice because of the limitations of charity’s inherent effect upon the social order. In other words, benevolent contributions by members of the Christian faith fall short of actually addressing the public social concerns to which they are directed because the concern itself is consequential in form to an underlying cause that has produced it. Simply said: Bread views charity as limited in that it addresses the effect but never the catalyst. On the other hand, however, when Christians lobby government—which has resources, capabilities, and powers to vastly do more to effect change than charitable individuals or groups—the root cause of societal injustices are directly addressed. “For this reason,” Beckmann and Simon argue, “the government has a responsibility to guarantee public justice.” To them, charity alone cannot ensure public justice. Justice must be achieved by working for it on the policy level. Hence, Bread asserts its lobbying efforts extend beyond charity into the realm of the pursuit of justice.

Concerned Women for America’s Theological Framework for Church Lobbying

The primary theological framework that buttresses CWA’s advocacy endeavors is evinced in their promulgation of a historical, cultural, social, and political

interpretation of the influence of a Judeo-Christian doctrine that has, in their estimation, contributed to the fashioning of the U.S. socio-political existence since the nation's founding. Consequently, this Judeo-Christian worldview—based on certain espoused principles derived from scripture and contextualized within early American history—is touted as the archetypal standard for ecclesiastical bodies in the United States, within any given historical context, to reference in order to assess and recalibrate the national, cultural, and socio-political conditions of society. The current national social conditions, in CWA's opinion, are adrift from their original design.

Furthermore, this religio-historical analysis, contextualized within the early events associated with the founding of the republic, purports the church's original role in the United States as an active influencer in shaping political realities. This is reflective of the Puritan model of political engagement and the conservative social reform movements of the early 1800s. In light of such contentions, ecclesiastical leadership in the realm of political life, particularly during this stated period, serves as a model precedent and thus provides a replicable norm for political engagement for church leadership today. For this reason, CWA upholds that lobbying based on Judeo-Christian values is completely congruous with the historical relationship between the church and government as is evident, in their view, even before the founding of United States of America.

A clear case that soundly substantiates CWA's theological position is advanced in its public communiqué entitled, "Political Guidelines for Churches and Pastors." The following quote, by Dr. D. James Kennedy, prominently stands at the beginning of the document as a means of introducing the overall theme, tracking with CWA's justification for engaging in "legislative activity."⁷⁶³ It states:

In 1776, the most influential man in the little town of Lexington was a parson by the name of Jonas Clark. On the night Paul Revere made his famous ride, Parson Clark was having dinner with John Hancock and Samuel Adams. These two great patriots asked Clark the question: If war came, would the men of Lexington fight? Rev. Clark replied that he had trained them for that very hour. The next day, the "shot heard' round the world" was fired only a few yards from his parsonage.

[Our liberty] began in a church—with a parson not afraid to speak out on the great issues of freedom and tyranny. The resounding sermons preached by "the Black Regiment" (named because of the black robes the clergy wore at the time), of which Clark was a part, set the stage for the liberty of America...

Today, there is a great conflict of tremendous issues—the greatest battle in history. In *Slouching Toward Gomorrah*, Judge Robert Bork quotes from William Butler Yeats' poem titled *The Second Coming* [of Christ]: "The best

lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity.” —
Excerpted from the Memorial Day 1997 sermon text of Dr. D. James Kennedy

The magniloquence of Dr. Kennedy’s rhetoric inspires a certain patriotic, and yet, spiritual zeal within the hearts of all would-be adherents in his quest to stir them to action in the political field of battle as warrior agents fighting against all social forces in opposition to their innermost politico-spiritual convictions. Demonstrably, their purported grounds of defense for contemporary ecclesiastical political engagement are not solely based on a biblical exegetical process, but manifestly extracted from this sort of American Judeo-Christian civic religion, which first emerged in the colonial period of American history.

Furthermore, CWA unequivocally infers a direct connection between the cited “parsons” political activities and lobbying nowadays as a contemporary expression of that very same spirit of ecclesiastical political engagement demonstrated in that earlier period. To further substantiate this point, directly following Dr. Kennedy’s quote in that same document, the following assertions are made: “Churches can make a tremendous difference in government and public policy by helping the members of their congregations be informed, responsible citizens... One of the most important tasks a church can perform is to teach its members how to be effective citizens.”⁷⁶⁴ CWA proceeds to suggest that pastors should enlighten their congregants to the fact that “contacting legislators; urging church members and others to communicate with legislators; and circulating petitions” are viable means for concerned Christian citizens to counter socio-cultural antagonism at odds with the traditional type of American Civic Christianity they have come to embrace. Subsequently, it is here, in this unique interplay between the historical activities of certain segments of American Protestant Church life and CWA’s theologically formulated Judeo-Christian framework, that their justification for lobbying is mainly derived.

However, there lies within this theological framework a distinct romanticizing of this juncture in American Church history, which in its particularization idealizes, arguably to the point of deification, the successes of certain church bodies during that era without questioning any possible shortcomings of those groups. Instead, the categorical approbation of their unique contribution in ushering a new political order of governance based on Judeo-Christian principles is orthodoxy. Subsequently, CWA and likeminded proponents use this premise as a starting point for lobbying efforts that

affirm historical American church figures' activities, alongside the principles derived from the Scriptures by statesmen, as directly aiding in the birth of the nation. In other words, in their judgment a distinct Judeo-Christian worldview functioned as the foremost ideological/theological impetus guiding and influencing the socio-political character of the nation since its founding.⁷⁶⁵

Moreover, a principal consequence of this reasoning extends beyond the obvious of persuading church groups to replicate the colonial American church's behavioral pattern of political engagement by way of lobbying today. It further intimates the promotion and reinforcement of an underlying nationalistic exceptionalism that echoes that of the "chosen people of Israel" nationalistic motif interpreted from the Scriptures.⁷⁶⁶ This also finds its roots in Puritan theology. Groups like CWA may not state this outright, but this is a logical consequence to the claim of a Judeo-Christian nationalistic framework. In the opinion of many people who hold this theological construction, the United States is believed to be a sort of 'new Israel' based on Judeo-Christian principles, and favored by God with an unparalleled, transcendent status and purpose in the world. Consequently, adherents to this theological position seek to attribute, or impress upon, a diverse and pluralistic democratic nation of people—as the United States has remained since its inception—somewhat of a divinely instituted, nationally acknowledged, and mutually accepted covenantal status between United States and the God of the Christian faith.

Furthermore, CWA seeks to support this position, not only by highlighting examples of church political engagement in that era, they also seek to identify historical examples of the nation's founders' embrace of Christian principles generally. An often-cited source by these religious entities is a letter from James Madison to Thomas Jefferson, wherein Madison details a varied and extensive denominational listing from which a host of patriots emerged and united in the fight for liberty against a tyrannical English government. Often missing from their lists, however, are the atheists and deists mentioned by Madison.⁷⁶⁷ "The GENERAL PRINCIPLES on which the fathers achieved independence," Madison asserts, "... [were] the GENERAL PRINCIPLES of Christianity, in which all those sects were united; and the GENERAL PRINCIPLES of English and American liberty, in which all these young men united, and which had united all parties in America, in majorities sufficient to assert and maintain her independence."⁷⁶⁸ Thus, CWA contends that historical proof of this kind substantiates the claim that biblical principles were mined, formulated, and applied to American society for the specific

purpose of building an ideal Judeo-Christian governing construct. Besides this notion, is the equally existent and fully embraced recognition of the suitability of a legal governmental framework, as established by the Founders, which simultaneously and consciously restricts any one ecclesiastical body's monopolistic control over government itself. Consequently, considering these factors in concert with each other, what has resulted is that amongst different Christian groups, there is an unquestioned acceptance of the United States being founded on Judeo-Christian principles. Their confidence in this presupposition further explains how the consequent, yet questionable, underlying belief of a covenantal and national exceptionalism has taken root in public consciousness as a motif.

However, there is no historical evidence to substantiate any covenantal claims attributed expressly to the founders of the nation as a unified expression amongst themselves. Unambiguously, central doctrines of the Church—for example, the Trinity, miracles, new covenant or soteriological theological constructs—were non-considerations, and, thus, played no factor in shaping the nation's governmental system. Madison's letter to Jefferson mentioned above substantiates this claim, as Madison in his opening paragraphs makes it explicitly clear his disagreements toward individuals who force such doctrinal positions upon the larger public.⁷⁶⁹ The only support to the claim of a covenanted national status rests in the unsubstantiated opinions prevalent within popular imagination that have come to believe this myth.

Clearly, this study does not intend to deemphasize the church's vital role in shaping socio-political life in the United States broadly, or suggest that the founders were not intentional in their exploit of Judeo-Christian principles. Historically, such is the case, as has been proven in this study. However, the crucial point is that the idea of a U.S. exceptionalism—principally based on the adoption of the covenant community motif found in the biblical narrative—has no credible historical basis expressly in relation to the original intent behind the founders' establishment of the nation.

Although the unsubstantiated theological motif may assist in explaining certain contemporary societal effects that resulted from the historical acknowledgement of the primary function of Judeo-Christian principles during the Revolutionary period, CWA's theological formulation for lobbying is not based on these effects but on the acknowledged cause. To elucidate its specific position, on the one hand, the form of American Judeo-Christian civic engagement CWA propagates is certainly inspired by aspects of ecclesiastical influence in early American history. On the other hand, it is

also an outcome of the founders' political machinations, which were in part supported by unifying principles found within scripture, as well as other ancient political texts.⁷⁷⁰ In CWA's opinion, each stated variable in unison served to inspire and shape the national culture and is thus the perfect prototype for ecclesiastical political engagement. It is out of this perception that church bodies during the colonial era functioned as "divine instruments" that assisted in facilitating the emergence of "God's model nation." As such, this ecclesiastical historical example is reckoned luminous and worth replicating. Such a perspective serves, as inferred by Dr. Kennedy above, as a justification for the church's legitimacy in shaping governmental policy today that will ultimately ensure an evidential social, economic, and political prosperity like that reflective of times past. For this reason, CWA speaks of its lobbying activities against the secularization of American society as a means to recover "the boundless energy, amazing productivity, and endless possibilities that have grown from the fertile soil of liberty and moral virtue cultivated by earlier generations."⁷⁷¹

CWA's embrace of this sort of American Judeo-Christian civic engagement—or, arguably civic religion—not only provides the primary theological framework that justifies its lobbying; it provides the rubric through which the organization pursues policy. Specifically considering this theological rubric, the methods exemplified by the churches as highlighted in the colonial period, as well as the founders' example, in terms of both groups' embrace of biblical principles to achieve a nationalistic agenda, comprise the primary prism through which CWA makes its policy decisions. This is not the sole rubric, but it is the primary one, as shall be detailed. In fact, this factor is made explicit in CWA's mission statement: "Concerned Women for America protects and promotes Biblical values and Constitutional principles through prayer, education, and advocacy."⁷⁷² Consequently, this twinning of biblical values, with that of constitutional principles, results in a contrived theology of nationalism that assists CWA in navigating through a range of legislative options on Capitol Hill.

Upon closer analysis of CWA's specific public policy agenda, this underlying theological formulation of nationalism clearly comes into focus and demarcates the prism through which it conveys most of its issues agenda. To develop this theme a bit further, as a family value-oriented CLO, Beverly LaHaye has characterized CWA's lobbying efforts as a way for adherents to answer God's invitation "to draw together in the spirit of unity and purpose to protect the rights of family."⁷⁷³ She further encourages individuals sympathetic to that cause to "set aside... doctrinal differences to work for

a spiritually renewed America.”⁷⁷⁴ The nationalist motif and its direct link to an underlying theological underpinning of family are self-evident here. Furthermore, the idea of family as articulated by CWA functions as a coalescing principle, which in effect, transcends the doctrinal divisions that may otherwise exist.

As previously reviewed, this understanding of family is explicated by and bound to certain theological formulations related to human sexuality and human reproduction—all of which fall under CWA’s broader nationalistic thematic construction. Regarding CWA’s “Defense of the Family” issue area, CWA lobbies for legislation in support of traditional marriage as biblically defined and against any legislation in favor of legalizing same-sex marriage. CWA defends this position theologically by underscoring biblical passages that focus on the design of families. For example, it highlights passages like Matthew 19:4-6, which states, “And He answered and said to them, ‘Have you not read that He who made them at the beginning “made them male and female,” and said, “For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh”?’ So then, they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate.”⁷⁷⁵ In light of such passages, CWA maintains that the policies it lobbies for in this area seek to ensure that “the family esteemed as the bedrock institution of society consisting of individuals related by blood, marriage (the legal union of one man and one woman), birth, or adoption.”⁷⁷⁶ Once again, the merging of a nationalistic tendency, with the mining of a biblical passage of relevance, frames the pragmatic approach to realize CWA’s brand of Judeo-Christian civic engagement through lobbying.

Moreover, in CWA’s opinion, all other forms of marriage, outside of the latter, are a deviation from God’s original design and constitute sin that provokes God’s judgment upon a nation. LaHaye unequivocally spells out CWA’s theological position by calling for a spiritual counter movement to what they profess as a number of social contraventions, including alternative forms of marriage as specified, which they also contend have become pervasive in American society. “We are here,” LaHaye explains, “to offer healing to our land of its sins against God. We are to act, so God’s promise in 2 Chronicles 7:14 can become reality: ‘If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and forgive their sin and will heal their land.’”⁷⁷⁷ The transformation of a sinful nation is, as evident, the object of CWA’s mission. Hence, it is this nationalistic civic theology as contrived that informs a large part of CWA’s

public policy pursuits, which LaHaye contends is the way “to be a powerful influence in America for righteousness.”⁷⁷⁸

***United States Conference of Catholic Bishop’s Office of Government Relations on
Catholic Social Teaching and Church Lobbying***

The theological framework that inspires and informs the USCCB’s lobbying activities on Capitol Hill is grounded in the church’s rich tradition of Catholic social teaching. Accordingly, Catholic social teaching is the product of one divine source, and yet multiple streams, of authoritative ecclesiastical reflections that have converged and contributed to its development and compilation over the years. In fact, the sole origin of all the streams of Catholic social teachings, as the USCCB contends, extends from Jesus Christ himself. “Catholic social teaching,” as Colecchi surmises, “finds its beginning and end in the person of Jesus. Jesus is the Christ, the alpha and the omega, the beginning and the end (Rev 1:8). In the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth, we find God’s presence embodied in human history. In the mission and teaching of Jesus we find revealed God’s plan for each of us individually, for humanity, and indeed for all creation, as a whole (Rom 8).”⁷⁷⁹ Hence, it is in the didactics of Jesus Christ that the USCCB finds the spring and archetypal expression of human socio-political engagement fitting to all societies.

Furthermore, considering a trinitarian hermeneutic of God’s eternity, Catholic theologians contend that Catholic social teaching was, in fact, manifest during periods that preceded the incarnation of Jesus Christ as a historical personality. As USCCB maintains, “Catholic social teaching is a central and essential element of our faith. Its roots are in the Hebrew prophets who announced God’s special love for the poor and called God’s people to a covenant of love and justice. It is a teaching founded on the life and words of Jesus Christ, who came ‘to bring glad tidings to the poor... liberty to captives... recovery of sight to the blind’ (Lk 4:18-19), and who identified himself with ‘the least of these,’ the hungry and the stranger (cf. Mt 25:45).”⁷⁸⁰ Therefore, an advanced Christological hermeneutic of the Old and New Testaments functions as the primary theological stream of influence from which Catholic social teachings are extracted.

Additionally, several encyclicals composed by various popes, numerous theological expositions written by bishops and ecclesiastical councils, and an array of

official church documents—all in concert with each other—function as distinct sources of theological input in the development of Catholic social teaching. An important example derived from this particular category is the well-known encyclical penned by Pope Leo XIII in the early 1890s, which continues to serve as a key and often consulted precedent to-date. At the time of its publication, Pope Leo formulated an apt Catholic response to the challenging social conditions instigated by industrialization. “Most theologians,” Colecchi corroborates, “trace the modern phase of Catholic social teaching back to Pope Leo XIII. In 1891 Pope Leo wrote the ground-breaking encyclical letter *On the Conditions of Workers (Rerum Novarum)*. In this teaching letter, the pope addressed the terrible exploitation and poverty of European and North America workers at the beginning of the industrial era.”⁷⁸¹ As Reinhold Niebuhr suggests, “The static inequalities of an agrarian society were transmuted into the dynamic inequalities of an industrial age.”⁷⁸² Industrialization fostered jarring inequalities amongst workers residing in the identified countries, who were en masse subjected to incomprehensibly inhumane working and living conditions. Conversely, a consequent to these pullulating industrial economies was immense wealth creation on the part of owners whose financial legerdemain did not go unnoticed by social critics of various persuasions. The glaring unequal distribution of that wealth, and debilitating socio-economic conditions resultant to industrial life, necessitated a theologically pertinent rejoinder by Catholic ecclesiastical leadership that assisted in determining Catholic socio-political engagement.

Pope Leo provided the essential church response that applicably fit that historical context and its respective challenges. This is a fundamental quality of Catholic social teaching generally. That is, Church doctrine and tradition are studiously consulted to address all anthropological conditions or dilemmas. Colecchi adroitly unfolds this perspective in simple, yet insightful terms: “Catholic social teaching is not new; it is as ancient as the Scriptures. Yet Catholic social teaching is ever new; it is a living tradition that has grown throughout the centuries as God’s people have encountered new social realities and challenges.”⁷⁸³ As a consequence of the shifting social, economic, and political conditions, Catholic social teaching seeks to appropriately apply the basic, relevant, and yet eternal principles gathered from the scriptures and Church tradition to the present or looming social realities.

Additionally, in every historical period, the fundamental question of how to ensure justice within society remains unchanged for Catholic social teaching.

Therefore, to achieve this aim, a well-formulated theology of justice undergirds Catholic Social Teaching. “In their 1986 pastoral letter on *Economic Justice for All*,” Kramer confirms, “the U.S. bishops remind their readers of the three classical forms of justice: commutative justice (dealing with fairness in contracts among individuals and private social groups), distributive justice, and social justice.”⁷⁸⁴ As stated, communicative justice reflects a social condition of fairness or equal treatment among members of society, particularly as distinguished by the securing of individual rights and the application of laws indiscriminately. Distributive justice, on the other hand, “requires that the allocation of income, wealth, and power in society be evaluated in light of its effects on persons whose basic material needs are unmet.”⁷⁸⁵ Lastly, as Kettern informs, “Social justice finds its fulfillment in social love, which forms the actual foundation of social peace. It is bent on ‘bringing about the ideal social order, which strives for the common good, where the coordination of the different claims and achievements simply remains inadequate.’”⁷⁸⁶ Although justice, as a theological construct as reflected in this tripartite formulation, buttresses the overall lobbying work of USCCB, clearly the latter division encompasses the priors.

Furthermore, Catholic social teaching asserts that there are two primary methods to attain justice as a universal principle in society: through acts of charity and acts within the realm of social justice. Catholic scholars characterize this joint approach as the “Two Feet of Love in Action.”⁷⁸⁷ In their opinion, charity is an effective form of justice in that it meets the direct needs of individuals or groups, while social justice seeks to change the social, economic, and political conditions that perpetuate such needs in a given society. Therefore, the justification for lobbying is clear: it is a principal means to pursue social justice to realize systemic transformation within the public realm and create a more just society.

Moreover, there are seven primary theological themes that constitute the basic elements of Catholic social teaching, guiding USCCB’s social justice efforts: “Life and Dignity of the Human Person; Call to Family, Community, and Participation; Rights and Responsibilities; Option for and with the Poor and Vulnerable; The Dignity of Works and the Rights of Workers; Solidarity; and Care for God’s Creation.”⁷⁸⁸ The first of all seven themes, “Life and Dignity of the Human Person,” is purported to be the very basis on which the remaining six are built. Additionally, it is this fundamental theological concept that informs all the policy positions adopted and pursued by the USCCB. The *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (Gaudium et*

Spes), produced at the Second Vatican Council, communicates Catholic social teaching in relation to this theme as follows:

“Furthermore, whatever is opposed to life itself, such as any type of murder, genocide, abortion, euthanasia, or willful self-destruction, whatever violates the integrity of the human person... whatever insults human dignity, such as subhuman living conditions, arbitrary imprisonment, deportation, slavery, prostitution, the selling of women and children; as well as disgraceful working conditions, where men are treated as mere tools for profit, rather than as free and responsible persons; all these things and others of their like are infamies indeed. They poison human society... Moreover, they are a supreme dishonor to the Creator.”⁷⁸⁹

This position is further substantiated by biblical passages that the USCCB argues clearly affirm the life and dignity of all human beings. Justifying this view, for example, the USCCB quotes verses directly from Genesis 1:26-31, which state, “Then God said: ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and the cattle, and over all the wild animals and all the creatures that crawl on the ground.’ God created man in his image; / in the divine image he created him; / male and female he created them.”⁷⁹⁰ These biblical verses within the Creation narrative reveal a certain divine attribute exists within each human being—one that is, ideally, to be respected for its innate worth. On this theological premise, the USCCB concludes, “the measure of every institution is whether it threatens or enhances the life and dignity of the human person.”⁷⁹¹ As such, this is the fundamental rubric through which the USCCB purports it pursues all its policies, whether domestic or international.

Chapter 4

Theological profile for CLOs

CLOs: Political Theology

“We should demonstrate to the former that no State has ever been founded without a religious basis, and to the latter, that the law of Christianity at bottom does more harm by weakening than good by strengthening the constitution of the State.”⁷⁹²

- Jean-Jacques Rousseau on Civil Religion

The citing of the passage above penned by celebrated Genevan political philosopher Rousseau is certainly not done with the intention of rendering a comprehensive endorsement of his claims regarding the effect of Christianity on the state. Nonetheless, despite the philosopher’s overtly biased leanings, there are two judicial assertions of sufficient accuracy worth recognition and explication for this study. The first is the historical function religion has occupied in the establishment of states; the second is the evident relational effect Christianity, as a religious movement, has had on varying forms of government in the past, which in Rousseau’s opinion, clearly engendered an absolute danger to such governments’ existence.

Accordingly, as an advocate for the state apparatus, Rousseau clearly concludes that the ideals of that institution and the fundamental principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ were inherently and perpetually antagonistic toward one another. For this reason, he argues,

“Religion, considered in relation to society, which is either general or particular, may also be divided into two kinds: the religion of man, and that of the citizen. The first, which has neither temples, nor altars, nor rites, and is confined to the purely internal cult of the supreme God and the eternal obligations of morality, is the religion of the Gospel pure and simple, the true theism, what may be called natural divine right or law. The other, which is codified in a single country, gives it its gods, and its own tutelary patrons; it has its dogmas, its rites and its external cult prescribed by law; outside the single nation that follows it, all the world is in its sight infidel, foreign, and barbarous; the duties and the rights of men extend for it only as far as its own altars. Of this kind were all the religions of early peoples, which we may define as civil or positive divine right of law.

There is a third sort of religion of a more singular kind, which gives men two codes of legislation, two rulers, and two countries, renders them subject to contradictory duties, and makes it impossible for them to be faithful both to religion and citizenship.”⁷⁹³

Rousseau proceeds to develop his argument by emphasizing certain theological constructs and existential characteristics of the Christian faith, that in his opinion obstruct one's complete loyalty to the state. In fact, the accuracy of every factor Rousseau employs to undergird his claim is of less significance to this study than the exactitude of his implication that for disciples of Jesus Christ, loyalty to Christ is affirmed as preeminent to all institutions of governing established by men or women. Consequently, the Christian's first obligation is to the law of Christ and when the laws of society are at variance with Christ's rule, as Church history further corroborates, Christians are generally recognized as challenging state authority by defying such laws, which of course, contributes to the stated antagonism. This fact has proven itself repeatedly for millennia without reprieve. Historically, nonetheless, it is out of this primal antagonism that Christian lobbyists, in general, have been inspired to confront the politically powerful and exert Christ's sovereignty above government. This is clearly seen in the labors of Christian abolitionists and civil rights leaders of the past, and social justice-oriented CLOs of contemporary history. The liberationist motif that inspires Bread's lobbying work, described in the previous chapter, clearly conforms to this assertion.

Furthermore, within this ancient antagonism is an inherent animosity. Surely, however, this should not be interpreted to mean a reciprocal animosity. For the animosity is uniformly one-sided as it is a response to that antagonistic source that, as stated, is fundamentally based on a devout adherence to the law and reign of the kingdom of Christ. Therefore, the origin of all such animosities rests, not within the Christian individual or group, but within the bosom of threatened rulers, queens, kings, governors, and authorities to whose corrupted authority such Christians refuse to bow. There is no better example of this fact than that of the bloody images of civil rights leaders, who, inspired by their faith, refused to bow down to the injustices of that day, as they labored nonviolently alongside likeminded ecclesiastical leaders with the aim of securing civil rights legislation.

In fact, this animosity, held by political authorities as a result of this inexorable oppositional stance of disciples, is a prevailing characteristic of the historical interplay between the Christian faith and the state. As has been shown, CLOs use the scriptures as a primary source to inspire their political action. Both the Old and New Testaments are mined by these groups to justify dissent when government appears to stray from

their theological designs of what a just society should be. This signature characteristic of this type of dissent, furthermore, is particularly distinct in the Gospels, which describe the events surrounding the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Expressly, Jesus was born into a political context when the governing power at that time sought with great determination to extinguish any political challengers to Israel's throne. Namely, Herod the Great is by far one of the most recognizable historical figures of that era, as his unrelenting thirst for power distinguished him from all other political contenders. His adoption of exceptionally brutal tactics to seize power is detailed in extra-biblical sources.⁷⁹⁴ Namely, after the Roman invasion and annexing of Jerusalem in 63 B.C., the victors established a puppet government that was in force untenable. What resulted was a vacuum of power with former ruling family members from the Hasmoneans' family line contending for hegemonic political control. It was under these conditions that Herod politically outmaneuvers his opponents to seize the reins of power.

In recounting the historical backdrop that led to Herod's political ascent, Hendricks discloses, "Hasmonean influence was eclipsed altogether in 40 B.C., when a young man of half-Idumean—that is, half Arab—descent was recognized with great ceremony by both Mark Antony and Octavian as their client-king in Israel. That young man was Herod the Great, a megalomaniacal Hasmonean descendant."⁷⁹⁵ Hendricks continues, "He was completely lacking in loyalty to his forebears, but he still had to contend with the Hasmonean factions each of which vied for Israel's throne."⁷⁹⁶ Consequently, with the sole aim of defeating all rivals, Herod embarks on a campaign of terror and bloodshed that culminated only "after an extensive siege of Jerusalem with an army of eleven infantry battalions and six hundred cavalry. Josephus describes the scene: 'When the troops poured in, a scene of wholesale massacre ensued... the Jews of Herod's army were determined to leave none of their opponents alive. Masses were butchered in the alleys, ...' (History of the Jewish War, 1:342-346)."⁷⁹⁷ It is in Josephus' historiographical work that we capture a lucid picture of the past milieu and political realism predominant in Palestine around the time of Jesus of Nazareth's birth.

Matthew's gospel narrative corroborates Josephus' depiction of Herod's ruthless public persona, as the evangelist illustrates the activities surrounding Jesus' entrance upon the stage of human history. Herod, as portrayed in that account, makes every attempt to terminate the life of the child of whose monarchical claim to Israel's throne Herod is fully aware by way of the wise men who inform him of Jesus' recent

birth. In the pronouncements of the prophet Micah, the wise men disclose the exact location in which the child was born: “But you, O Bethlehem of Ephrathah, who are one of the little clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to rule in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days” (Micah 5:2).⁷⁹⁸ Thus, it is in response to the birth of this child—a perceived emergent political threat—that Herod sets forth his deadly edict that resulted in the massacre of all the children in Bethlehem, as well as its surrounding areas, who fit the profile of the newborn ruler of Israel.⁷⁹⁹

Likewise, the Synoptic gospels jointly portray the conspiratorial nature of religio-political authorities’ undertakings in an effort to discredit and halt Jesus’ growing influence at the height of his ministry. For according to these sources, it was the unparalleled brilliance of Jesus’ wisdom which not only illuminated his countenance; it exposed Israel’s religio-political leadership’s decrees, customs, and behaviors as hallow and deceptive religious contrivances. Self-righteousness was the manifestation of their hypocrisy, a conceptualized behavioral pattern built on deceit, by, to adopt Tolstoy’s phrase, “acting—playing a part.”⁸⁰⁰ However, Jesus’ sincere and exemplary expressions of love were more than just emotive; they were divine and volitional, not based on any conditionality.

Still, Jesus preached the kingdom of God—a heavenly and eternal force that is the sovereign reigns above all sovereignties. F.F. Bruce, in elaborating the historical roots of the “Kingdom motif” in Jewish history reveals, “The kingdom, or kingship, of God, is a recurrent theme in the Old Testament. ‘The Lord sits enthroned as king for ever’ (Ps. 29: 10; ‘The Lord has established his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom rules over all’ (Ps. 103: 19).”⁸⁰¹ “Mark,” he expounds, “probably the earliest of our four evangelists, says that, after the arrest of John the Baptist, ‘Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, ‘The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel.’”⁸⁰² The kingdom’s workings, as Jesus preached and demonstrated, are invasive, expansive, and unstoppable. And unlike the “kingdom of ends” endorsed by Kant,⁸⁰³ the kingdom of God preached by Jesus is not a spiritual force or a political condition based on humanity’s self-determined rationalistic moral imposition of such. The conditions of the kingdom of God are not inaugurated by individuals’ wills and capacities to do so.⁸⁰⁴ The eternal origins of the kingdom of God Jesus preached are in God, and God directs its teleological trajectory in human affairs by the power of God’s Spirit. Thus, the kingdom’s aim is the emancipation of the poor, the captive, the blind, and the oppressed through the Spirit’s

inspiration within the hearts of women and men.⁸⁰⁵ The kingdom's social claim is that God's essential relational characteristic is "Heavenly Parent," a title that binds people of diverse cultures, languages, and nations into a sacred and spiritual familial covenant. Hence, the kingdom of God's reaches beyond the confines of nationally contrived borders and extends to and beyond all habitable parts of the world.

Consequently, it was Jesus's authoritative teaching that centered on the kingdom of God, coupled with his demonstrative displays of its veracity and efficacy, that provoked the religio-political establishment's acrimony and eagerness to collude and arrest him in an attempt to rid the world of him. It was this conspiratorial determination that ultimately contributed to the state-sponsored execution of the Nazarene, which all Gospels affirm was authorized by the Roman government in direct complicity with Jewish religious officials. As F.F. Bruce succinctly surmises, "Any message which implied, however remotely, the supersession of the Roman Empire by a new order was bound to incur the suspicion of Rome, and in fact Jesus ended his public activity by being executed on the charge of sedition by sentence of a Roman magistrate."⁸⁰⁶ Thus, on Golgotha's hill, the inscription detailing his official charges, "King of the Jews,"⁸⁰⁷—as is denoted in all the Gospels—tells it all: "Jesus is being executed for presuming to challenge the authority of Rome."⁸⁰⁸

Although each Gospel differs slightly in its accounts, all affirm the antagonistic effect that Christ's life, teachings, and assertions about the kingdom of God had on the governing authorities, whose animosities reached a decisive apex as is demonstrated in his crucifixion. This antagonism was consequent to his birth; palpable throughout his ministry; evident at his death; and, after the claims of his resurrection, persistent in the life of the Early Church.

The foregoing, yet underlying, political methodology of biblical hermeneutics at a minimum substantiates the inherent conflict Rousseau unearthed as existent between the Christian faith and governing powers. Moreover, this approach, which distinctly falls within the branch of political theology,⁸⁰⁹ has inspired and aided in shaping the theological views of Christian lobbyists—many of whom have directly employed this hermeneutical approach to shape the theological basis for their political engagement. Furthermore, it is this type of Jesuological biblical hermeneutic that focuses on the actual events in the life of Jesus, particularly his central teachings on the kingdom of God, that further assists in suitably constructing a theological profile for social justice-oriented CLOs. Sojourners' understanding of the 'kingdom of God,'

Bread's biblical topoi of 'hunger advocacy,' and Catholic Social teaching in part embrace this approach.

Meyers, furthermore, provides insight into the outlines of a political biblical hermeneutic that some CLOs have embraced. In his seminal work, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*, Meyers constructs one of the most extensive studies on the Gospel of Mark by employing this hermeneutical approach. Justifying his adoption of this methodology, at the onset of this work he discursively acknowledges, "We need no longer belabor *whether* the Bible calls us to political practice—only *what kind* of practice."⁸¹⁰ Evidently, in Meyer's estimation, the textual and contextual evidence is so extensive in support of the former, it is in an effort to address the latter question that majority of his writing is dedicated.

Subsequently, at the culmination of his efforts, Meyer discloses what he considers to be the predominant paradigmatic motif resultant from his political hermeneutical investigation of Mark's Gospel. "At the heart of Mark's political, social, and economic alternatives to the dominant order," he reveals, "lies a radical new symbolic system based upon the primacy of human need (3:4)."⁸¹¹ Hence, the kingdom of God is demonstrated through Jesus' example of addressing the spiritual dimensions of human needs, particularly through his didactics and orthopraxy. The practical effect is identified by the believer's experience of a deliverance from any such deficits, while simultaneously evoking a communal coalescence of spiritually renewed persons that in force delegitimizes any oppressive religious, social, or political structures that function as the source by which the variant social conditions are otherwise sustained. This, he argues, provides the most efficient model for socio-political engagement for disciples generally. Sojourners' theological construct of the kingdom of God as reviewed previously articulates such a theological position in justification of their advocacy.

Additionally, Meyer's political hermeneutical approach to the Gospel of Mark leads him to conclude that this form of social justice is best achieved as disciples embrace "the political practice of militant nonviolent struggle."⁸¹² In his opinion, Gandhi's political strategy of *satyagraha* best defines this proposed tactic.⁸¹³ He avers this is the most illustrative formula of Jesus' political activities in recent history, which is also most in alignment with Mark's depiction of Christ. Accordingly, social justice-oriented CLOs, particularly those active during the civil rights era, adopted this strategy with great success. However, the particularization evident in Meyer's elevation of this one strategy, as the sole Markian-sanctioned means to achieve social justice, coupled

with his clear promulgation of it as a political practice to be employed by Christians generally, inadvertently overlooks the pneumatological impetus behind the political approach itself. In other words, such considerations reveal a certain transcendent peculiarity over time or context pervasive in the larger canon that attests to the achievement of God's justice through innumerable means befitting to the historical circumstances faced. Nevertheless, the political hermeneutical methodology Meyer employs, as well as his stated outcomes, aid in apprehending the general theological profile of CLOs. Ultimately, Meyer's work achieves its stated purpose by stimulating a "renewed ideological struggle over how the Bible is politically interpreted and used."⁸¹⁴

Meyers' theological formulation of social justice, and proposed political method to achieve that objective, are grounded in a biblical hermeneutic that is shared by various CLOs and scholars whose work falls within the realm of political theology. One such additional personality relevant to this study is Jürgen Moltmann. Accordingly, in constructing his ilk of political theology, he asserts the Bible as the cardinal source for political engagement. "The Church needs the Bible as its foundation and the public discussion as a check," writes Moltmann."⁸¹⁵ It is this perceived necessity, indispensability, and authority of the biblical message that clearly inspires the work of certain lobby organizations.

Additionally, Moltmann makes the following critique of a particular hegemonic hermeneutic of Christian salvation prevalent today: "Christian theology has continually interpreted in soteriological terms the history of the Christ... But a theological interpretation of the political dimension of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus is absent."⁸¹⁶ As will be explored later in this chapter, this critique echoes the likes of Walter Rauschenbusch who developed a social Gospel theory as a way to challenge the normative soteriological interpretations of the Christian faith during his era. The embrace of such a theological position by Rauschenbusch led to the establishment of CLOs like the Federal Council of Churches during the first decade of the 1900s. Moltmann's critique provides credence to CLOs generally who seek to understand the political import of the cross in relation to salvation and society. It is to this principal aim, filling an apparent void in Christian theology, that Moltmann scholarship is committed. Richard Bauckham confirms, "...for Moltmann Christian political engagement is no substitute for Christian faith but one of the forms which faith must

take in action; and political theology is no substitute for dogmatic theology, but theology's critical reflection on its political function."⁸¹⁷

Subsequently, Moltmann's critical reflection frames a political theology that focuses on the centrality of the cross within Christian faith. It is in the cross of Jesus Christ, he argues, that disciples find their "relevance" and "identity."⁸¹⁸ The workings of the kingdom of God as understood from the events leading up to and surrounding the crucifixion and resurrection, as well as didactical expressions of Jesus, assist in establishing a proper spiritual orientation for disciples, while the exercise of the law of love in society inevitably produces a corresponding political outcome. Here the idea of social justice as understood in Catholic social teaching is most relevant; for social justice is a manifestation of social love which also reveals itself in the political realm. Moltmann argues, "There is no vertical dimension of faith opposed to a horizontal dimension of political love, for in every sphere of life the powers of the coming new creation are in conflict with the powers of a world structure which leads to death."⁸¹⁹ This vertical and horizontal dynamic within the Christian faith cannot be overstated in Moltmann's theology and espoused orthopraxy. As Paeth additionally confirms, "To remove them from history is not to fulfill the promise, but rather to substitute a heavenly state for the embodied presence of God's Kingdom on earth, and it is this trend in the history of theology that Moltmann vigorously rejects."⁸²⁰

Hence, Christian witnesses express this divine form of political love on the horizontal plane of human history. CLOs of various types hold to this claim. In fact, this political love to which Moltmann refers, is evident in the revelation of the crucified and glorious Christ that, while distinctly political, is also compellingly spiritual. Consequently, that distinction entails that all social, economic, and, of course, political contrivances stand in its judgment to be rightly assessed. Equally, this political love is made visible in a distinct correctness in the lives of disciples of Jesus Christ. According to Moltmann, this is achieved, in part, by way of a certain Christological identification. For in the cross, he contends, Christ himself identifies with the "poor, the oppressed and the humiliated".⁸²¹ As such, this, too, is where his disciples' identification should be. Bread and the USCCB's OGR are two examples of CLOs where the concept of a preferential option for the poor is held and seeks to achieve this identification. For Moltmann, this type of identification substantiates an array of political approaches, policies, and programs that seek to alleviate the suffering of those whom Christ personally identifies with on the cross, as previously mentioned. From this vantage

point, a theology of liberation emerges. “The rule of Christ,” Moltmann further clarifies, “who was crucified for political reasons can only be extended through liberation from forms of rule which make men servile and apathetic and the political religions which give them stability.”⁸²² It is to this charge—to serve as instruments of liberation—Christ sanctions his disciples as a countering force of political love confronting political systems that persecute or oppress affected segments of society. To practically achieve this objective, Moltmann contends democratic participation is a viable method “in activating the people from their apathy as subjects towards responsible participation in the processes of political decisions.”⁸²³ “This interpretative strategy,” Paeth further underscores, “emerges from Moltmann’s conviction that Christian faith is rooted in the history of God’s involvement with the world, and this involvement requires concrete responsibilities of Christians.”⁸²⁴

Moltmann is often critiqued as the principal architect of an approach that fuses Christian theology with social theory in a historically contextualized manner.⁸²⁵ Namely, “John Milbank and Arne Ramusson argue that political theologies such as Moltmann’s are ultimately contradictory and self-destructive. They argue instead that for a Christian theology that self-consciously divorces itself from such correlation projects.”⁸²⁶ Their criticisms, however, disregard a long history of theologians who employed scripture as a basis for hermeneutical outcomes that were appropriated as a means to address the specific socio-political exigencies of their times. In fact, Moltmann adopts a methodology whereby scripture functions as a divine intermediary to assist Christians in critical analysis of modern politico-social constructs and challenges, as well as determining an apposite ecclesiastical praxis. This fundamentally correlates with all the CLOs in this study.

Viewing CLOs as a phenomenon, Moltmann’s ruminations highlighting democratic participation as an advisable act to transform society are noteworthy. As considered throughout this study, this assertion on the part of Moltmann is universally accepted and adopted by CLOs, as they seek to influence the existent democratic institutions of governance in which they are demonstrably active participants. Besides, Moltmann’s theological formulations of ‘identification’ and ‘liberation’ provide a distinct defense for social-justice oriented CLOs’ activities like Bread and Sojourners.

In addition to Moltmann and Meyers, renowned Swiss theologian and political activist Karl Barth “saw how our Christian belief makes a difference for how we are political.”⁸²⁷ In *Dogmatics in Outline*, Barth sets forth his theological designs

concerning the sovereignty of God and avers, “God is superior to all powers. These powers force themselves on our notice quite differently from God. They appear genuinely real. God is not in the series of these worldly powers, perhaps as the highest of them; but He is superior to all other powers, neither limited or conditioned by them, but He is the Lord of all lords, the King of all kings.”⁸²⁸ To highlight this quote is not to suggest that Barth developed a political theology in the manner of Moltmann or Meyer. In fact, scholars like Werner G. Jeanrond argue, “Barth’s theological method makes the development of a political theology impossible.”⁸²⁹ Actually, a major challenge Barth faced in his lifetime was the reconstituting of faith in God back into theological institutions of higher learning. Jeanrond affirms, “Barth’s ‘revolutionary’ understanding of theology as motivated and guided by faith alone helped to destroy the traditional German understanding of academic theology originally formulated by Friedrich Schleiermacher at the beginning of the nineteenth century.”⁸³⁰ Hence his focus was not on constructing a political theology; it was calling for a return to certain orthodoxy in the Christian faith. Nonetheless, in light of his interpretation of the nature of God and God’s sovereign rule, there is little astonishment that Barth was a leading voice within the Confessing Church, serving as an oppositional voice to Hitler’s intrigues during Nazi Germany. “In a letter to French Protestants in December 1939,” specifically, “Karl Barth wrote that the church should witness uncompromisingly to Christians in Germany: ‘Your cause is not just! ...Have no more to do with this Hitler! Hands off this war! It is his war alone! Change course while there is yet time!’”⁸³¹ Consequently, it is this abiding allegiance to the kingdom of God espoused by men and women of the Christian faith, as exemplified in Barth, that has contributed historically to the perpetual political conflict existent between the antagonistic spiritual forces all the theologians above insightfully apprehend.

As a final consideration, Hauerwas and Willimon contend, “Each age must come, fresh and new, to the realization that God, not nations, rules the world.”⁸³² It is for this very reason, since the inception of the Church, successive generations of disciples have discovered themselves engaged in a spiritual struggle against antagonistic worldly powers. CLOs of past and present have viewed themselves at the forefront of this divine struggle. The theologians in the realm of political theology referenced above, illustratively provide key theological insights into the factors that inspire the activities of CLOs as they seek to challenge societal injustice and remain faithful to the message and principles of the kingdom of God.

CLOs: John Calvin's Political Theology

John Calvin is another leading voice who has made a significant contribution in shaping American Protestantism's perceptions of the appropriate relationship between the church and politics. In *Institutio Christianae Religionis, Book IV, Chapter 20*, Calvin argues, "...there are two governments to which mankind is subject."⁸³³ Calvin goes on to delineate these two forms of governmental authority as the "spiritual kingdom of Christ and civil government."⁸³⁴ Calvin's theological designs distinguish the "spiritual kingdom of Christ" from that of the mechanism of secular government. His juxtaposition results in a parallelism absent of certain antagonisms held by e.g., St. Augustin and Martin Luther.⁸³⁵

Martin Luther, in particular, perceived the mechanism of government as a God-ordained instrument "necessary only for those who are not true Christians."⁸³⁶ To Luther, Christians and non-Christian were caught in the dialectical struggle between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world, as each side sought to influence the political machinery's objectives. "Calvin," however, as Vandrunen explains, "distinguished clearly between Christ's redemptive rule in the spiritual kingdom, experienced now in the church, and God's providential rule in the civil kingdom, comprising the state and various areas of life outside of the church."⁸³⁷

Calvin essentially disregards the foregoing antagonisms discerned by Luther and simultaneously attributes a divine sanction to the mechanism of governance and whoever controls its administration. Furthermore, this divine sanction is purported to be other than the concretizing of the kingdom of Christ into a governmental form. This, Calvin argues, is an impossibility based on the spiritual nature of the kingdom of Christ. For this reason, he pens the following statement:

"For when people hear that the Gospel promises a liberty which acknowledges neither king nor magistrate (FV: master) among men, but relies on Christ alone, they cannot imagine that any benefit can be derived from this liberty as long as they find themselves subject to any authority whatever... But anyone who knows how to distinguish between body and soul, between this present transitory life and the eternal life to come, will not find it difficult to understand that the spiritual kingdom of Christ and civil government are things far removed from one another. It is a Judaic folly to look for the kingdom of Christ among the things that make up this world, and to shut it up among them; our opinion, which is supported by the plainest teaching of Scripture, is that, on the contrary, the fruit we reap from grace is a spiritual fruit."⁸³⁸

Therefore, civil government is viewed as a political construct from which the “spiritual kingdom of Christ” is demarcated and transcends. Calvin, however, delineates and attributes a divine function to the church and government. For Calvin, Graffin clarifies, “The church is established to speak the word, deliver the sacraments, and give counsel in matters related to family and morality, but has no power to convict criminals or collect taxes. The state, conversely, has laws to establish order in civil society and processes to convict those who disrupt that order, but has no right to exercise power in spiritual matters.”⁸³⁹ Certain scholars contend, a few consequences of Calvin’s political theology are that it promotes “a divine sanction of the state, inculcates a positive attitude to politics and law, and persistently urges the principle of obedience to rulers.”⁸⁴⁰ As H.J. Grimm advances, Calvin actually argues in favor of a “theocratic conception of government.”⁸⁴¹

Furthermore, Calvin’s theological reflections on civil government—based largely on a Pauline theological perspective—specifically conclude that civil government has a divinely ordained function that includes, amongst a longer list of obligations, the defense of religious liberty. In direct relation to this theme, Calvin asserts, “The end of secular government, however, while we remain in this world, is [1559:] to foster and protect the external worship of God, defend pure doctrine (FV: and religion) and the good condition of the Church, accommodate the way we live to [requirements of] human society, [1536:] mould our conduct to civil justice, reconcile us one to another, and uphold and defend the common peace and tranquility.”⁸⁴² Additionally, he claims that “it prevents idolatries, sacrileges against the name of God, blasphemies against his truth, and other scandals to religion from emerging into the light of day and spreading (FV: being sown) among the people; it prevents disturbances in the public peace; it allows each to remain safe and unharmed in the enjoyment of what is his; it makes possible innocent contacts between people [1539:] and it sees to the cultivation of upright conduct and decency.”⁸⁴³

Moreover, J.T. McNeill argues spiritedly that Calvin possessed a strong penchant for democratic processes in government and asserts, “[Calvin] had a preference for the election of rulers by the people.”⁸⁴⁴ In *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, Calvin’s does initially claim the most reasonable form of government to ensure the above objectives is an “aristocracy”.⁸⁴⁵ Calvin, however, proceeds to develop an extensive argument based on scriptural evidence as to why monarchies are

“inherently better.”⁸⁴⁶ He asserts that citizens of any given “commonwealth” are to faithfully obey the monarch in power, “because in obeying their superiors they are obeying God himself, since their power is from God.”⁸⁴⁷ The supposition claimed here is principally based on the following passages of which Calvin quotes: “‘Let every soul’, says Paul (Rom. 13:1), ‘be subject to the higher powers, for whoever resists the power resists the ordinance of God.’ And he writes to Titus (3:1): ‘Exhort them to be subject to principalities and powers; they should obey the magistrates and be ready for every good work.’”⁸⁴⁸

According to Calvin, a type of unwavering obedience is due to a monarch, whether that monarch is benevolent or tyrannical. In situations of the latter, Calvin unequivocally discourages any sort of reprisal on the part of victims. “If we keep firmly in mind,” he argues, “that even the very worst kings are appointed by this same decree which establishes the authority of kings [in general], then we will never permit ourselves the seditious idea that the king is to be treated according to his deserts, or that we need not obey a king who does not conduct himself towards us like a king.”⁸⁴⁹ With noticeable brevity, Calvin concludes his work with a statement that appears to contradict the foregoing argument. He avers, “We are subject to those who have been placed over us, but only in him. If they command anything against [his will], it must be as nothing to us. And in this instance we must ignore all that dignity that magistrates (FV: superiors) possess.”⁸⁵⁰ It is from such a quote that certain scholars derive that Calvin “can hardly be regarded as indifferent to kingship itself.”⁸⁵¹ Perhaps Bouwsma surmises Calvin’s position best: “His [Calvin’s] own political instincts were highly conservative, and he preached the submission of private persons to all legitimate authority.”⁸⁵²

The outcomes of Calvin’s theological designs as reviewed are particularly vital in understanding the theological profile of certain CLOs’ today. First, his extrication of the kingdom of Christ as a transcendent spiritual force from civil government, while simultaneously framing a theology of government that attributes divine sanction to its offices and representatives, is in effect an early historical manifestation of a kind of civil religion based on Judeo-Christian principles. Additionally, this type of religious/governmental construction predominantly falls under Rousseau’s’ third category of government, “which gives men two codes of legislation, two rulers, and two countries, renders them subject to contradictory duties, and makes it impossible for them to be faithful both to religion and citizenship.”⁸⁵³ The idea professed by various

CLOs that the U.S. government was founded on specific Judeo-Christian principles, with a divinely sanctioned trajectory, is in consonance with Calvinistic thought as expressed here. Accordingly, Calvin's political theology appears as a historical precedent for family value-oriented CLOs like CWA that promote "Biblical values and Constitutional principles through prayer, education, and advocacy."⁸⁵⁴

Second, this theological formulation intrinsically supports a nationalistic agenda where the primary loyalty of Christians of a respective nation is to the secular authority of the nation in question, as opposed to the Church universal, which transcends all national boundaries. This underlying Calvinistic interpretation manifests itself today in the form of nationalistic policies that communicate a chief loyalty foremost to state autonomy. CLOs that lobby for the securing of national borders substantiate this claim. The supranational ideals of the Christian faith that embrace all people, cultures, and nationalities as neighbor are generally ancillary to national interests. Certainly, many of the family-valued oriented CLOs examined in this study support this type of nationalistic agenda, derived from Calvinistic political theology.

Finally, Calvin's theological designs clearly argue that the principal function of the state apparatus is to preserve religious liberty. Needless to say, this study has shown repeatedly that this principle has been adopted as a policy priority for various CLOs despite their divergent theological and political backgrounds.

CLOs: Social Gospel Theory

Additionally, Social Gospel theorists effectively aid in constructing a theological profile for CLOs. The Social Gospel movement emerged in the United States around the latter part of the 1800s. As Rossinow informs, "This movement to apply Christianity's message of salvation to society as well as to the individual in an urban, industrial age extends well past the World War I era."⁸⁵⁵ Perhaps the most prominent of all Social Gospel theorists is Walter Rauschenbusch, whose body of scholarship extensively focuses on the social affect of the kingdom of God.⁸⁵⁶

Before briefly delving into Rauschenbusch's claims in relation to the kingdom of God, it is important to note a fundamental challenge articulated in his writings against a certain aberrant doctrinal construct rooted in Calvinism, which he identified within an expression of American Protestantism during his lifetime. In short, Rauschenbusch questioned and vigorously contested the soteriological formulation that

focused primarily on one's "individual" or "personal" salvation to the exclusion of social engagement. He discloses that this understanding of Christianity "was strong in creating a conviction of personal sin, an assurance of personal forgiveness and adoption, and a firm hope of immortality, but weak in social hope and aims."⁸⁵⁷ As a way to counteract what was, in his opinion, a deviant theological formulation, Rauschenbusch composed his well-known book entitled, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. He reveals in no uncertain terms his motivation behind writing that work: "to show that the social gospel is a vital part of the Christian conception of sin and salvation, and that any teaching on the sinful condition of the race and on its redemption from evil which fails to do justice to the social factors and processes in sin and redemption, must be incomplete, unreal, and misleading."⁸⁵⁸

His positively expressed contention is that the authentic and practical effects of salvation extend from, and yet beyond, the heart of one's personal spiritual experience into the variant social spheres that that person occupies. The converted woman or man knows firsthand that wherever there are voids of that same transformative Spirit, there is an opportunity fill those spaces. Furthermore, since social, economic, and political organizations are comprised of human agents that can influence the range and quality of their organization's missions, where individuals are who have professed a personal salvific encounter with Christ, an inherent outcome is the divine compulsion to imbue their social associations with that same spiritual force. This central message of Rauschenbusch echoes the theological reflections of Albrecht Ritschl, who contended, "The kingdom is the community in which God's righteousness is being realized in history, but the relations that define that community are inclusive of political and social as well as religious relations."⁸⁵⁹ The call to engage in social transformation, furthermore, proved to be quite attractive in building that theological movement. "For most of the later social gospel exponents, reform activity sprang not from a sense of moral obligation alone but primarily from a belief in the social nature of religious experience," W. M. King confirms.⁸⁶⁰

The preceding theological proposition is central to apprehending an essential underpinning existent in Rauschenbusch's theology of the kingdom of God. On this theme, he writes, "The Kingdom of God is not a concept nor an ideal merely, but an historical force. It is a vital and organizing energy now at work in humanity. Its capacity to save the social order depends on its pervasive presence within the social organism. Every institutional foothold gained gives a purchase for attacking the next vantage-

point.”⁸⁶¹ Furthermore, he contends, “The problem of the social gospel is how the divine life of Christ can get control of human society. The social gospel is concerned about a progressive social incarnation of God.”⁸⁶² Evidently, these principles recapture the essence of what Augustine and Luther assessed, and what Calvin clearly overlooked. That is, as the kingdom of God permeates the hearts of men and women, it inherently and manifestly affects the social order in the struggle for dominion over and against all oppositional social and spiritual forces.

Moreover, Rauschenbusch’s principal quest was to resurrect a theology of the kingdom of God of which he perceived had been disregarded, coopted, or substituted by the predominant form of Protestantism practiced by American churches of his era. In this view, he charges, “When the doctrine of the Kingdom of God is lacking in theology, the salvation of the individual is seen in its relation to the Church and to the future life, but not in its relation to the task of saving the social order.”⁸⁶³ So to counter this prevailing theological convention, he constructs the theological foundation for the Social Gospel by employing a Christological biblical hermeneutic. In detailing the import and centrality of such an approach Rauschenbusch writes,

“Christianity was pure and unperverted when it lived as a divine reality in the heart of Jesus Christ. But in his mind its purpose was summed up in one great word: the Reign of God. To this he dedicated himself in baptism. This set him the problems which he faced in the wilderness temptations. This was center to the parables and prophecies. This explains the ethical standards which he set up in the sermon on the mount. It is the Reign of God on earth for which he consumed his strength, for which he died, and for which he promised to return.”⁸⁶⁴

It is from this vantage point that Rauschenbusch envisages and promulgates what a social expression of the “Reign of God” would effectively entail in his historical context. He asserts the prime prism through which Christian men and women could assess and rectify societal conditions is revealed in an orthopraxy reflective of the love of Jesus, as detailed in the Gospel accounts. For him this is the most effective way to achieve the missional impact of the Social Gospel in the world. Furthermore, he articulates what this type of practice entails, as he constructs a historically contextual biblical hermeneutic that aligns with the purported love ethic as described. He then conjoins this interpretation with a corresponding socio-political application that addresses a concurrent societal malady extant. This methodological approach is quite evident in the following quote:

“Since love is the supreme law of Christ, the Kingdom of God implies a progressive reign of love in human affairs. We can see its advance wherever the free will of love supersedes the use of force and legal coercion as a regulative of the social order. This involves the redemption of society from political autocracies and economic oligarchies; the substitution of redemptive for vindictive penology; the abolition of constraint through hunger as part of the industrial system; and the abolition of war as the supreme expression of hate and the completest cessation of freedom.”⁸⁶⁵

Moreover, Rauschenbusch employs the same method regarding a theological hermeneutic and social application, further asserting:

“Since Christ revealed the divine worth of life and personality, and since his salvation seeks the restoration and fulfilment of even the least, it follows that the Kingdom of God, at every stage of human development, tends toward a social order which will best guarantee to all personalities their freest and highest development. This involves the redemption of social life from the cramping influence of religious bigotry, from the repression of self-assertion in the relation of upper and lower classes, and from all forms of slavery in which human beings are treated as mere means to serve the ends of others.”⁸⁶⁶

Consequently, with the emergence of the Social Gospel, there is also the reemergence of a socio-political biblical hermeneutic centered firmly on a Christological foundation. The embrace of this methodological approach is clearly a rejection of certain Calvinistic doctrinal positions on secular authority that relegated the kingdom of Christ to a spiritual delimitation. Rauschenbusch is clear on this matter and sees the Social Gospel as recapturing what some of the previous generations of Christian reformers neglected; of which he concludes is the most essential factor of the Christian faith itself. “The Reformation,” he argues, “of the sixteenth century was a revival of Pauline theology. The present-day Reformation is a revival of the spirit and aim of Jesus himself.”⁸⁶⁷

Considering these theological insights, the Social Gospel is of great import in developing a theological profile for CLOs. This is especially true for those whose organizational missions are in consonance with the principles of social justice that Rauschenbusch espoused. Furthermore, the Social Gospel serves as a historical precedence for the application of social teachings mined from the Gospel narratives to be employed to address social injustices. Second, the Social Gospel’s method of prophetically critiquing ecclesiastical norms is also relevant to the work of CLOs. During Rauschenbusch’s lifetime, when he was faced with the negative social outcomes of industrialization, urbanization, and capitalism, he promulgated a Social Gospel that

not only directed a call for justice at the centers of power and authority; it also challenged the status quo orthodoxy and orthopraxy of ecclesiastical institutions distinguished by their insularity. Social justice-oriented CLOs continue this work by calling church bodies to move beyond their walls of worship to a socio-political engagement reflective of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ.

Third, the political theology espoused by the Social Gospel inspires eager adherents to critically reflect on what practical means disciples can adopt to express the love of Christ more effectively in the social and political realms. CLOs' founders, staff, and members clearly seek to embrace this call as they labor in their respective fields of Christian advocacy.

Lastly, the Social Gospel's aims are transnational in scope. Its concerns are not relegated only to certain national boundaries, as it relates to the realization of social justice in the world. This is a common characteristic of the work of numerous social justice-oriented CLOs, known to pursue international policies that are fundamentally in accord with Rauschenbusch's assertion that "Jesus emancipated the idea of the Kingdom from previous nationalistic limitations and from the debasement of lower religious tendencies, and made it world-wide and spiritual."⁸⁶⁸ As a consequence, CLOs' lobbying efforts to address humanitarian concerns abroad as detailed, by pursuing effective and requisite policy initiatives in their national legislatures, bear witness to the universal Reign of God.

CLOs: Christian Realism

The world could not have fully comprehended the deadly outcome that would result after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914. Millions of military combatants and innocent civilians fell victim to the horrors of the war that ensued. World War I seemed to prove accurate Hobbesian thought⁸⁶⁹ on humanity's primal state of nature, as the nations of the world found themselves embroiled in deadly conflict. In global politics, the hatred, greed, and violence reflective of the kingdom of the world appeared to have triumphed over the love, self-denial, and peace of the kingdom of God.

This notion was particularly substantiated by the fact that after a tenuous peace had come to the world at the conclusion of the Great War; the tragic lessons of the past were quickly forgotten. Approximately two decades later, on September 1, 1939, the

world, once again, descended into a state of warfare. This time, however, at the conclusion of World War II, the death toll dwarfed that of the First World War with tens of millions of people estimated to have died as a result. Considering these historical realities, theologians of that era were particularly challenged to rethink the fundamental nature of this new type of humanity that, in its heightened stage of technological advancement, was able to collectively unleash forces so destructive that the very survival of the species was threatened by self-annihilation. Consequently, it is in this historical, social, and political context that Christian realism as an academic discipline comes into being. Namely, Reinhold Niebuhr is attributed with its genesis as a discipline within the fields of theology and social ethics, and is, up-to-date, recognized as its foremost intellectual.

Accordingly, the hopes associated with the Social Gospel that projected a Christian worldview which envisaged the boundless possibilities of the kingdom of God's positive influence upon global affairs were tempered by Niebuhr's realist approach calling for a Christian social engagement that fully recognized and added into its equation a sober apprehension of individuals' and social collectives' penchant toward accumulating power. This particular concept is central to understanding Niebuhr's theological designs. Thus, Niebuhr builds support for his argument based on a primordial "contradiction" relative to all human existence.⁸⁷⁰ Albert Ritschel—with whom Niebuhr agrees on this specific point—describes it as "the contradiction in which man finds himself as both a part of nature and a spiritual personality claiming to dominate nature."⁸⁷¹ It is here, according to Niebuhr, between "finiteness and freedom" that the "occasion for sin" is framed.⁸⁷² He further clarifies: "Sin is not caused by the contradiction because, according to Biblical faith, there is no absolute necessity that man should be betrayed into sin by the ambiguity of his position, as standing in and yet above nature."⁸⁷³ However, in this state of nature, sin emerges as a consequence of an individual's egotistical self-determination "to overcome his insecurity by a will-to-power which overreaches the limits of creatureliness."⁸⁷⁴ "Man's pride and will-to-power disturb the harmony of creation," Niebuhr ultimately asserts.⁸⁷⁵

Niebuhr goes on to persuasively argue that the origin of all injustice in the world is best understood through the biblical notion of sin. "The Bible," he informs, "defines sin in both religious and moral terms. The religious dimension of sin is man's rebellion against God, his effort to usurp the place of God. The moral and social dimension of sin is injustice. The ego which falsely makes itself the centre of existence in its pride

and will-to-power inevitably subordinates other life to its will and thus does injustice to other life.”⁸⁷⁶ Consequently, the root cause of societal injustice in all its forms—including hunger, poverty, exploitation, oppression, and enslavement—is an unfettered ego determined to control a natural environment by which it sees itself imperiled. This tendency is, furthermore, exponentially exacerbated as egos unite en masse and force. In discussing this theme Niebuhr resolves, “In every human group there is less reason to guide and to check impulse, less capacity of self-transcendence, less ability to comprehend the needs of other and therefore more unrestrained egoism than the individuals, who compose the group, reveal in their personal relationships.”⁸⁷⁷ In the end, this collective group force—if not restrained or counter-balanced by just as powerful of a group force—unleashes a group impulse bent on the subjugation, and if not controlled, the destruction of other politically weaker groups. Therefore, Niebuhr surmises, “...that when collective power, whether in the form of imperialism or call domination, exploits weakness, it can never be dislodged unless power is raised against it.”⁸⁷⁸ Moreover, Niebuhr views appealing to the conscience of such collectives by way of rational persuasion as an insufficient method for viable change. Coercive political power must accompany it. “Since reason,” he maintains, “is always to some degree, the servant of interest in a social situation, social injustice cannot be resolved by moral and rational suasion alone, as the educator and social scientist usually believes. Conflict is inevitable, and in this conflict power must be challenged by power.”⁸⁷⁹

Fundamentally, it is this reversal in vantage point, specifically in relation to that of Social Gospel theorists, by which Niebuhr rouses adherents to reckon with the deep-seeded and resilient nature of sin in society. Furthermore, his theological formulations instigate a deeper reflection on the adoption of coercive political measures to stay the effects of sins’ bleak expression driven by group egoism which targets politically weaker social groups. Although Niebuhr severely critiques Luther’s doctrine of the two kingdoms as encouraging “quietism” and “defeatism”,⁸⁸⁰ certain ideas Niebuhr presents are partially reflective of Lutheran thought which contends that a primary function of secular authority is its coercive function.⁸⁸¹ Furthermore, Niebuhr’s thoughts echoes Luther’s, who also legitimated coercion as a tool for Christians to employ in service of neighbor, specifically in the context of government.

This leads to a key conclusion Niebuhr arrives at in determining a viable coercive method to promote and maintain justice in society. He categorically argues that “democracy is a method of finding proximate solutions for insoluble problems.”⁸⁸²

Niebuhr, clearly aware of the anarchical propensities within the international order, and the inclination for even democracies to exert a precarious national egoism, argues for democratic participation as the most constructive means for individuals to counter sin in the terms already described. “He persuaded me,” Schlesinger reflects on Niebuhr’s broader influence, “and many of my contemporaries that original sin provides a far stronger foundation for freedom and self-government than illusions about human perfectibility.”⁸⁸³

Niebuhr’s theological designs have had a tremendous influence in shaping the views and undertakings of especially social justice-oriented CLOs and their organizational leaders. A clear example is that of Bread for the World founder Art Simon who directly sat under the tutelage of Niebuhr at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.⁸⁸⁴ In his writings, Simon readily admits to Niebuhr’s significant influence in shaping his thinking. In addition, Niebuhr’s intelligibility on societal sin, the nefarious societal function of collective egoism, and the necessity of coercive measures to counter such egoism influenced men like Martin Luther King, Jr., Eugene Carson Blake, and a host of other men and women, who appropriated Niebuhr’s ideas to various ecclesiastical movements for social change.

Furthermore, these concepts are embodied in CLOs’ activities to-date, as they seek to influence Congress and the administration to legislate and enforce laws that will establish justice in society. This clearly affirms Niebuhr’s promulgations have been adopted by CLOs of various stripes as their preferred means to influence society through democratic participation.

It is through democratic civic engagement that numerous women and men of the Christian faith find an apt expression for a type of political love grounded in the love of Jesus Christ. Similarly recognized, however, is that their persistent democratic participation challenges the likelihood of inequalities gaining a foothold in society. In light of this motivation, certain CLOs seek to prevent the triumph of a societal sin that Niebuhr greatly clarifies and admonishes against. Hence, they have heeded his call to act in defense of democracy. They aim to be what Niebuhr avers as “the most effective opponents of tyrannical government [who] are today, as they have been in past, men [and women] who can say, ‘We must obey God rather than man.’”⁸⁸⁵

Conclusion

The historical emergence, development, and normalization of CLOs within the United States of America, as demonstrated in this study, is the product of a long history of ecclesiastical civic engagement. Undeniably, since the inception of the nation as a sovereign political actor on the world stage, church bodies have actively sought to influence the policies of the U.S. government. This factor is evident in every historical period of the nation, including the years of independence, Antebellum, the Civil War, Reconstruction, World Wars I and II, the civil rights movement, and right up to today. Christian lobbying as a permanent institutionalized presence in the nation's Capital, however, has existed for a little over a century now, with the civil rights movement serving as the catalyst that helped inspire the unprecedented growth that ensued in Washington, D.C., in the 1970s.

This study has clearly demonstrated that, despite the pluralistic tenor of the United States, with all its scientific and technological advancements, the notion that civil policy should be conducted without the influence of religion has never fully materialized in America. Secularism has proven itself a less formidable foe to the influence of religion in shaping American public life. It is a deep-seeded religious belief that continues to inspire various church groups' lobbying activities today. Additionally, the notion that there was ever a period in U.S. history when the church groups universally refrained from political activity is simply unfounded. Most ecclesiastical bodies never interpreted the separation of church and state to mean recusal from political engagement. The pioneering works of Ebersole, Adams, Hertzke, and now this current study, demonstrate the veracity of these historical claims in significant detail. Separation of church and state, instead, was understood by most religious bodies as a national policy in support of disestablishment. Furthermore, it is the First Amendment that established lobbying as a legally protected means for both religious and secular groups to share their concerns and promote their interests.

As noted, the primary distinguishing factor between CLOs and secular lobbying forces is the stated impetus behind their lobbying. CLOs purport their lobbying activities as an apposite demonstration of their Christian witness. This is a common bond among all CLOs, which clearly diverges from the self-interests or special interests associated with secular lobbying entities. Besides, no matter their political positions, CLOs of various categories—church-based or individual membership-based—all seek

to justify their policy agenda and choice of lobbying with a distinct theological basis. As is evident, their theological outcomes and policy adoptions differ widely. Despite their variances, another thread of commonality that binds them is the practice of lobbying itself—albeit, rationalizations in its defense also differ largely from organization to organization.

Given Church history, CLOs' theological profile rests firmly within the field of political theology. Specifically, the political theologies of Calvin, Rauschenbusch, and Niebuhr, among the other theologians explored, satisfactorily aid in constructing a suitable theological profile for CLOs past and present. The findings are corollary to these theologians' intellectual quests to ascertain a historically and contextually appropriate biblical hermeneutic to engage secular authority, as they also offer a corresponding ecclesiastical response. Their ideas are of chief importance to the theological outcomes of this study. Specifically, their polemics in relation to the kingdom of God and God's sovereignty over human affairs offer theological insights worthy of consideration, as Christian men and women seek to apprehend an appropriate relationship to politics. Moreover, Rauschenbusch's Social Gospel theory and Niebuhr's Christian realism, as immediate precursors to the historic growth of CLOs during the latter half of the twentieth century, jointly provide distinct theological stimuli that aided in the acceptance of this form of Christian political praxis, particularly as a viable method to transform democratic societies.

This study has also identified two predominant theological streams existent in U.S. ecclesiastical history, which are arguably diametrically opposed to each other. They show themselves distinctively in the realm of Christian lobbying. One manifests itself today under the category of social justice-oriented CLO, while the other falls within the category of family values-oriented CLO. Capitol Hill is the primary battleground of their clash of political values, as each organizational category labors to garner greater influence. This contemporary antagonism, however, can be traced back to Early American history. These two theological streams relate to either the expression of American Christianity that sought to create a just society for all people, or the expression of American Christianity that sought to preserve social, economic, and political influence in the face of emerging challengers. As shown, social justice-oriented CLOs find their historical precedents in the abolitionist and civil rights movements, while family values-oriented CLOs find their historical precedents in the social and moral reform movements of the past. The economic interests and privileges

that instigated these animosities remain far too often unpronounced. Historically, social justice-oriented CLOs' political activities have been directed at achieving greater access to economic privileges for vulnerable members of society, while family values-oriented CLOs' activities have been largely reactionary, as they seek to preserve their privileged way of life. This polarization continues to tear at the very fabric of American socio-political existence, and will do so in the years to come.

Finally, since the time of the Early Church, every generation of Christian disciples has been confronted with monumental socio-political challenges. Nothing has changed since then; though today, in our globalized, high-tech, information-driven, nuclear age—where the clash of cultures seems to move faster than the speed of light—the existent social, economic, and political challenges confronting the world are indubitably more pronounced. Thus, if not prudently addressed, such challenges clearly threaten human existence. Lobbying is a tool available for those of the Christian faith to tackle social, economic, and political challenges as they arise. It provides a political method to influence local, national, and international policy to express the love of Jesus Christ and counterbalance a prevailing self-interest in politics that has been known to be destructive to the common good. Unmistakably, this means practicing a self-denial exemplified in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. Additionally, as Luther rightly suggests, a Christian's exertions in politics should be directed toward serving one's neighbor, whether within one's national boundaries or beyond, in a form of political love based on seeking justice. This type of rubric in determining policy choices can only lead to the realization of the common good in the most comprehensive manner. In the author's estimation, this is the singular way to overcome the polarization existent between conservative and liberal Christian movements.

Furthermore, in the context of liberal constitutional democracies, like the United States of America, the false dichotomy between government and the governed should be seen for what it is—a mere illusion. For the governed are the government. Sovereignty, in a secular sense, rests within the bosom of the people. Therefore, those Christian men and women who aver a submission to the Authority of Heaven, as they simultaneously comprise the constituencies of their respective democratic nations, will let God reign through their civic participation. Such efforts may not establish the kingdom of God on earth in a concrete form, but it will certainly establish God's eternal influence in the realm of politics.

End Notes

Introduction

¹ The term Christian is used here in the broadest sense; it encompasses all of the various individuals or groups that admit some sort of confessional, denominational, or other affirmative tie to the historical movement that began with Jesus Christ in the first century CE. Furthermore, such adherents view the Hebrew Scriptures (Old Testament) and New Testament in the light of divine revelation. See Chadwick Henry, *The Early Church: The story of emergent Christianity from the apostolic age to the dividing of ways between the Greek East and the Latin West* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1993). Additionally, see Justo L. González, *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2010). For an explanation of the array of Christian groups considered in the context of the United States, see the Boise Center for Religion and American Public Life, “An Introduction to Christian Theology,” vol. 1 of the Boise Center Papers on Religion in the United States, 2007, accessed October 8, 2018, https://www.bc.edu/centers/boisi/publications/boisi_center_papers.html.

² Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful: Religious advocacy groups in Washington, D.C.* (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center: The Pew Forum On Religion & Public Life, 2012): 13, accessed March 21, 2015, http://www.pewforum.org/files/2011/11/ReligiousAdvocacy_web.pdf.

³ The term “religious” in this context refers to any sect or group that share a common system of belief.

⁴ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 23.

⁵ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 13.

⁶ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr. (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc., 1994), 96.

⁷ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 13.

⁸ For examples of CLOs’ advocacy efforts regarding complex humanitarian crises see Andrew Natsios, “NGOs and the UN system in complex humanitarian emergencies: Conflict or cooperation?,” *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 3, Nongovernmental Organizations, the United Nations and Global Governance (Sep., 1995): 405-419, accessed July 15, 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3992884>. Additionally, for specific accounts of domestic policy proposals supported by CLOs to address the stated concerns see David Werning, “Feeding the Hungry,” *Charities USA: The Magazine of Catholic Charities USA*, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Summer 2018): 8-9, accessed August 2, 2018, https://www.catholiccharitiesusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CharitiesUSA-Summer-2018_web.pdf; Sarah Hendley and Kimberly Mazcyk, “A ‘Month’ of Poverty,” *Charities USA: The Magazine of Catholic Charities USA*, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Summer 2018): 22-23, accessed August 2, 2018, https://www.catholiccharitiesusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CharitiesUSA-Summer-2018_web.pdf.

⁹ For examples of CLOs’ advocacy work on abortion and the legal definition of marriage respectively see Russell Moore, “Is Pro-Life Winning?,” *Light Magazine: Kingdom, Culture, Mission*, Vol. 1, Issue 2 (Winter 2015): 1, accessed August 2, 2018, https://d1nwfrzxhi18dp.cloudfront.net/uploads/resource_library/attachment/file/2/Winter_2015_Light_Magazine_-_Web.pdf; Andrew Walker and Eric Teetsel, *Marriage Is: How Marriage Transforms Society and Cultivates Human Flourishing* (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 2015), quoted in *Light Magazine: Kingdom, Culture, Mission*, Vol. 1, Issue 1 (Summer 2015): 30-31, accessed August 2, 2018, https://d1nwfrzxhi18dp.cloudfront.net/uploads/resource_library/attachment/file/31/Light_Magazine_-_Summer_2015_-_Web.pdf.

¹⁰ Laura Olson, “Mainline Protestant Washington offices and the political lives of clergy,” in *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*, ed. by R. Wuthnow & J. H. Evans (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002), 55.

¹¹ Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 2.

¹² Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 1.

¹³ Jeffrey Cox, “Secularization and Other Master Narratives of Religion in Modern Europe,” *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 14, No. 1, Christliche Religion in der Geschichtsschreibung des 20. Jahrhunderts (2001): 28, accessed July 2, 2019, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43100018>.

¹⁴ Liberal democracy as understood in this study refers to the system of governance prevalent in western democracies today, where the rule of law secures individual rights and freedoms. As defined: “A liberal democracy is a form of representative democracy with free and fair form of elections procedure and competitive political process. The most interesting feature of liberal democracy is that all adult citizens is given the right to vote regardless of race, gender or property ownership. A liberal democracy may take various constitutional forms such as constitutional republic, or federal republic, or constitutional monarchy, or presidential system, or parliamentary system, or a hybrid semi-presidential system” accessed October 10, 2018, see <https://definitions.uslegal.com/l/liberal-democracy/>. However, Charles W. Anderson offers a most suitable definition of the liberal democracy in light of this study, it is: “the work of ordinary people who, when they face predicaments, will reflect on what they are doing, will puzzle and try to improve and perfect their ways of doing things, rather than plod on mindlessly or lose their senses” in Charles W. Anderson, *A Deeper Freedom: Liberal Democracy as an Everyday Morality* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2002), 30. It is in the context of liberal democracies that this invitation to participate in the democratic process is afforded and welcomed. For additional information on the term liberal democracy, see Helena Catt, *Democracy in Practice* (London: Routledge, 1999).

¹⁵ James Walvin, “The slave trade, Quakers, and the early day of British abolition,” in *Quakers and Abolition* Carey, ed. Brychan Carey and Geoffrey Plank (Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2014), 165.

¹⁶ Ian Tyrrell, “Temperance, feminism, and the WCTU: New interpretations and new directions,” *Australasian Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (December 1986), 27-36.

¹⁷ Allen D. Hertzke, “The role and effectiveness of religious lobbies: A response to Robert Zwier,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr. (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc, 1994), 121.

¹⁸ For an example of a CLO’s lobbying activity around criminal justice reform see “Bible and Mass Incarceration,” Bread for the World, accessed October 1, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/downloads/gar-how-to-bible-mass-incar.pdf>.

¹⁹ For an example of a CLO’s lobbying activities on a range of issue mentioned above see “Policy Change,” Bread for the World, accessed October 1, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/policy-change>.

²⁰ In this study the terms “theology” and “Christian theology” are used interchangeably. To further clarify, theology is commonly defined as “the field of study of the divine things or religious truth” accessed October 10, 2018, see <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/theology?s=t>. This modern definition is consistent with St. Augustine who defines theology as “reasoning or discussion concerning the Deity” in Augustine, *City of God* 8.1. In the context of this study, St. Anselm the Benedictine monk’s ruminations in the preface to *Proslogion* is a more suitable definition of theology: “faith seeking understanding” in Anselm of Canterbury, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatise of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkin and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 89. In other words, the irrationality of Christian faith can gift rational constructs to help conceptualize the proper role and function of lobbying in the Christian experience.

²¹ Gustaf Aulén offers a suitable definition of the Church as understood in this study. He states: “1. The finished work of Christ is the foundation of the church, and in and through the exaltation the church appears as his continuous work. The church is, therefore, the reign or dominion of Christ on earth (*regnum Christi*), as this is exercised and perdures until consummation. 2. The church and Christ are correlative. Christ has become embodied in the Church... 3. The church is, therefore, a creation through the act of God in Christ. This may also be expressed in this way: the church is a fellowship created by the Holy Spirit” in Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, translated by Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), 329.

²² Allen D. Hertzke, “The role and effectiveness of religious lobbies: A response to Robert Zwier,” 121.

²³ The historical methodological approach basic aspects are as follows: “1. the recognition of a historical problem or the identification of a need for certain historical knowledge. 2. the gathering of as much relevant information about the problem or topic as possible. 3. if appropriate, the forming of hypothesis that tentatively explain relationships between historical factors. 4. The rigorous collection and organization of evidence, and the verification of the authenticity and veracity of information and its sources. 5. The selection, organization, and analysis of the most pertinent collected evidence, and the drawing of conclusions; and 6. the recording of conclusions in a meaningful narrative” in Charles Busha and Stephen P. Harter *Research Methods in Librarianship: Techniques and Interpretations* (Academic Press: New York, NY, 1980), accessed October 10, 2018, quoted in see <https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/~palmquis/courses/historical.htm>.

- ²⁴ Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, eds., *The Oral History Reader: Third Edition*, (New York: Routledge, 2016), xiii.
- ²⁵ See St. Anslem's *Proslogion*.
- ²⁶ John A. Coleman, S.J. ed., *Christian Political Ethics* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2008), 10.
- ²⁷ John A. Coleman, S.J. ed., *Christian Political Ethics*, 10.
- ²⁸ Art Simon, *Christian Faith & Public Policy: No Grounds for Divorce* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 109.
- ²⁹ Andrew Natsios, *U.S Foreign Policy and the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Humanitarian Relief in Complex Emergencies* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1997), 25.
- ³⁰ Luke E. Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1951), 179.
- ³¹ Luke E. Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 181.
- ³² Paul J. Weber review of the book by Allen D. Hertzke, *Representing God in Washington: The Role of Religious Lobbies in the American Polity*, in the *Journal of Law and Religion*, Vol. 8, No.1/2 (1990): 479.
- ³³ See book by R. Wuthnow & J. H. Evans, eds., *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism And the Public Role Of Mainline Protestantism* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002).
- ³⁴ W. B. Ragsdale, Jr. review of book by James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, in the *Journal of Church and State*, 13 (2), (1971): 358.
- ³⁵ Paul J. Weber review of the book by Allen D. Hertzke, *Representing God in Washington: The Role of Religious Lobbies in the American Polity*: 479.
- ³⁶ W. B. Ragsdale, Jr. review of book by James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, 358.
- ³⁷ Gordon K. Mantler, *Power to the Poor: Black-Brown Coalition and the Fight for Economic Justice, 1960-1974* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 19.
- ³⁸ For further insights into Dr. Martin Luther Kings, Jr.'s activism and lobbying efforts against the War in Vietnam see Henry E. Darby and Margaret N. Rowley, "King on Vietnam and beyond," *Phylon* (1960-), Vol. 47, No. 1 (1st Qtr., 1986): 43-50.
- ³⁹ Paul Lansing and Sarosh Kuruvilla, "Business Divestment in South Africa: In Who's Best Interest?," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 7(8) (1988): 561, accessed October 8, 2018, <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=2102&context=articles>
- ⁴⁰ Paul Lewis, "Leon Sullivan, 78, Dies," *The New York Times*, April 26, 2001, accessed August 17, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/04/26/world/leon-sullivan-78-dies-fought-apartheid.html>.
- ⁴¹ Lester Kurtz & K. G. Fulton, "Love your enemies? Protestants and United State foreign policy," in *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism And the Public Role Of Mainline Protestantism*, ed. R. Wuthnow & J. H. Evans (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002), 372.
- ⁴² Paul J. Weber review of the book by Allen D. Hertzke, *Representing God in Washington: The Role of Religious Lobbies in the American Polity*, 479.
- ⁴³ Paul J. Weber review of the book by Allen D. Hertzke, *Representing God in Washington: The Role of Religious Lobbies in the American Polity*, 479.
- ⁴⁴ See Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful: Religious advocacy groups in Washington, D.C.* (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center: The Pew Forum On Religion & Public Life, 2012), 13, accessed March 21, 2015, http://www.pewforum.org/files/2011/11/ReligiousAdvocacy_web.pdf.
- ⁴⁵ See Paul J. Weber, & W. L. Jones *U.S. Religious Interest Groups: Institutional Profiles* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1994).
- ⁴⁶ See James E. Wood, Jr., "Church Lobbying and Public Policy," in *Journal of Church and State*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (SPRING 1986): 183-192, accessed October 10, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23917653>
- ⁴⁷ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 11.
- ⁴⁸ See Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1917).
- ⁴⁹ Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1958), 91.
- ⁵⁰ See Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932).

⁵¹ See Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of its Traditional Defense* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944).

⁵² Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom*, 99.

⁵³ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), 202-203.

Chapter 1

⁵⁴ Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, "What Is This 'Lobbying' That We Are so Worried About?," *Yale Law & Policy Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Spring, 2008): 508, accessed February 17, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40239700>.

⁵⁵ For more information on the constitutionality of lobbying see Colleen McGuiness, ed., *The Washington Lobby: Fifth Edition* (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1987), 1-2.

⁵⁶ "Lobbying," Internal Revenue Service, last modified March 4, 2016, accessed January 3, 2017, <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/lobbying>.

⁵⁷ "Lobbying," United States Senate, accessed August 19, 2016, http://www.senate.gov/reference/reference_index_subjects/Lobbying_vrd.htm.

⁵⁸ Edward B. Logan and Simon N. Patten Fellow, "Lobbying," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 144, Supplement (Jul., 1929): 1-2, accessed September 29, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1017495>.

⁵⁹ Jeffrey M. Berry, *The Interest Group Society: Third Edition* (New York: Longman, Inc., 1997), 6.

⁶⁰ Colleen McGuiness, ed., *The Washington Lobby: Fifth Edition*, 3.

⁶¹ Jeffrey M. Berry, *The Interest Group Society: Third Edition*, 6.

⁶² Amy Melissa McKay, "The decision to lobby bureaucrats," *Public Choice*, Vol. 147, No. 1/2 (April 2011): 124, accessed July 29, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41483649>.

⁶³ Amy Melissa McKay, "The decision to lobby bureaucrats," 124.

⁶⁴ Bruce C. Wolpe, *Lobbying Congress: How the System Works* (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1990), 19.

⁶⁵ Bruce C. Wolpe, *Lobbying Congress*, 5.

⁶⁶ Bruce C. Wolpe, *Lobbying Congress*, 5-6.

⁶⁷ "Lobbying Database," Center for Responsive Politics, last modified October 28, 2016, accessed December 6, 2016, <https://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/>.

⁶⁸ "Lobbying Database," Center for Responsive Politics, last modified October 28, 2016, accessed December 6, 2016, <https://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/>.

⁶⁹ "Lobbying Database," Center for Responsive Politics, last modified October 28, 2016, accessed December 6, 2016, <https://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/>.

⁷⁰ See Josh Delk, "Analysis: Lobbying activity at highest level since 2010," *The Hill*, January 27, 2018, accessed October 12, 2018, <https://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/business-a-lobbying/371033-lobbying-activity-at-highest-level-since-2010-report>.

⁷¹ Megan R. Wilson, "Lobbying's top 50: Who's Spending big," *The Hill*, February 7, 2017, accessed October 10, 2018, <https://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/business-a-lobbying/318177-lobbyings-top-50-whos-spending-big/>.

⁷² Megan R. Wilson, "Lobbying's top 50: Who's Spending big," *The Hill*, February 7, 2017.

⁷³ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 14.

⁷⁴ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 14.

⁷⁵ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 15.

⁷⁶ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 15.

⁷⁷ "'Direct' and 'Grass Roots' Lobbying Defined," Internal Revenue Service, last modified March 18, 2016, accessed December 6, 2016, <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/direct-and-grass-roots-lobbying-defined>.

⁷⁸ "'Direct' and 'Grass Roots' Lobbying Defined," Internal Revenue Service, last modified March 18, 2016, accessed December 6, 2016, <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/direct-and-grass-roots-lobbying-defined>.

⁷⁹ Kenneth M. Goldstein, *Interest Groups, Lobbying, and Participation in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 22.

⁸⁰ Kenneth M. Goldstein, *Interest Groups, Lobbying, and Participation in America*, 126.

⁸¹ See Colleen McGuiness, ed., *The Washington Lobby*, 7.

⁸² Gregory A. Caldeira, Marie Hojnacki, and John R. Wright, “The Lobbying Activities of Organized Interests in Federal Judicial Nominations,” *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (Feb. 2000): 51, accessed December 17, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2647597.pdf>.

⁸³ Jonathan A. Obar, Paul Zube and Clifford Lampe, “Advocacy 2.0: An Analysis of How Advocacy Groups in the United States Perceive and Use Social Media as Tools for Facilitating Civic Engagement and Collective Action,” *Journal of Information Policy*, Vol. 2 (2012): 6, accessed December 17, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/10.5325/jinfopoli.2.2012.0001.pdf>.

⁸⁴ Nancy M. Short, “Influencing Health Policy: Strategies for Nursing Education to Partner with Nursing Practice,” *Journal of Professional Nursing*, Vol. 24, No. 5 (September-October), 2008: 268, accessed December 17, 2016. http://ac.els-cdn.com/S8755722307002372/1-s2.0-S8755722307002372-main.pdf?_tid=121ae52a-c480-11e6-a5fc-00000aab0f26&acdnat=1481996682_of77777571b422fd300b4f32d2271899.

⁸⁵ These terms are categories conceived by the author to express two clear approaches used by lobbyist to secure or defeat legislation in Congress.

⁸⁶ John Mark Hansen, *Gaining Access: Congress and the Farm Lobby, 1919-1981* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 112.

⁸⁷ John Mark Hansen, *Gaining Access*, 112.

⁸⁸ John Mark Hansen, *Gaining Access*, 116. For additional information on the Hope-Aiken Act of 1948 see Virgil W. Dean, *An Opportunity Lost: The Truman Administration and the Farm Policy Debate* (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2006).

⁸⁹ John Mark Hansen, *Gaining Access*, 113.

⁹⁰ John Mark Hansen, *Gaining Access*, 113.

⁹¹ John Mark Hansen, *Gaining Access*, 113.

⁹² For further examples of this type of lobbying see Timothy M. LaPira and Herschel F. Thomas, *Revolving Door Lobbying: Public Service, Private Influence, and the Unequal Representation of Interest* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2017).

⁹³ Kenneth M. Goldstein, *Interest Groups, Lobbying, And Participation in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1.

⁹⁴ Kenneth M. Goldstein, *Interest Groups, Lobbying, And Participation in America*, 1.

⁹⁵ Kenneth M. Goldstein, *Interest Groups, Lobbying, And Participation in America*, 1.

⁹⁶ Kenneth M. Goldstein, *Interest Groups, Lobbying, And Participation in America*, 2.

⁹⁷ Kevin W. Hula, *Lobbying Together: Interest Group Coalitions in Legislative Politics* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1999), 1.

⁹⁸ Kevin W. Hula, *Lobbying Together*, 1.

⁹⁹ Kevin W. Hula, *Lobbying Together*, 1.

¹⁰⁰ Kevin W. Hula, *Lobbying Together*, 1.

¹⁰¹ Kevin W. Hula, *Lobbying Together*, 1.

¹⁰² Kevin W. Hula, *Lobbying Together*, 1.

¹⁰³ Kevin W. Hula, *Lobbying Together*, 1.

¹⁰⁴ Edward B. Logan and Simon N. Patten Fellow, “Lobbying,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, Vol. 144, Supplement (Jul., 1929): 2, accessed April 10, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1017495>.

¹⁰⁵ Edward B. Logan and Simon N. Patten Fellow, “Lobbying,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, Vol. 144, Supplement (Jul., 1929): 2.

¹⁰⁶ The “common good” as referred to here takes on multiple connotations. First, it is used in the classical Aristotelian sense. Aristotle argues: “Even if the good is the same for the individual and the city, the good of the city clearly is the greater and more perfect thing to attain and to safeguard. The attainment of the good for one person alone is, to be sure, a source of satisfaction; yet to secure it for a nation and for cities is nobler and more divine” in Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1094b, quoted in David Hollenbach, S.J., *The Common Good and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 3. The relevance of Aristotle’s insights in this context is that the good of society ought to remain preeminent to individual or group interests, especially when the latter threatens the former. Second, it expresses an economic connotation, specifically in terms of the general welfare of society; however, as Mastromatteo and Solari rightly suggest, “It is not only an end-state within the economy a policy-maker should achieve but also a shared view of the ends of human interaction that is able to coordinate individuals” in Giuseppe Mastromatteo and Stefano Solari, “The Idea Of ‘Common Good’ and the Role of the State in Present Day Social Economics,” *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, Anno 122, No. 1 (Gennaio-Marzo 2014): 86, accessed October 12, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43830201>. Thus reason for the last connotation which “is the good of being a community or society at all” in David Hollenbach, S.J., *The Common Good and Christian*

Ethics, 9. Finn offers a relevant clarification for this third connotation, he writes: [the common good is] a set of conditions which enables the members of a community to attain for themselves reasonable objectives, or to realize reasonably for themselves the value(s) for the sake of which they have reason to collaborate with each other (positively and/or negatively) in a community in J. Finnis, *Natural Law and Natural Right* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 155, quoted in Giuseppe Mastromatteo and Stefano Solari, “The Idea of ‘Common Good’ and the Role of the State in Present Day Social Economics,” *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, Anno 122, No. 1 (Gennaio-Marzo 2014): 87.

¹⁰⁷ Edward B. Logan and Simon N. Patten Fellow, “Lobbying,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, Vol. 144, Supplement (Jul., 1929): 1, accessed October 4, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1017495>.

¹⁰⁸ Lee Drutman, “The Business of America is Lobbying: Explaining the Growth of Corporate Political Activity in Washington, DC,” *Techliberation*: 6, accessed January 3, 2017, https://techliberation.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/business_of_america_is_lobbying.pdf.

¹⁰⁹ Lee Drutman, “The Complexities of Lobbying: Toward a Deeper Understanding of the Profession,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (October 2010): 834, accessed October 4, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40927084>.

¹¹⁰ For additional information on the theories of lobbying see Sebastian Koehler, *Lobbying, Political Uncertainty and Policy Outcomes* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Morten Bennesen and Sven E. Feldmann, “Lobbying Legislators,” *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 110, No. 4 (August 2002): pp. 919-946, accessed October 12, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/340775>; and Andrew S. McFarland, “Interest Groups and Theories of Power in America,” *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Apr., 1987):129-147, accessed October 12, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/193940>.

¹¹¹ Lee Drutman, “The Complexities of Lobbying: Toward a Deeper Understanding of the Profession,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 834.

¹¹² It is important to note here that Political Action Committees (PACs) and Super PACs are political organizations with business or corporate affiliations that often hire lobbyists to push their legislative agenda on Capitol Hill. In fact, “(PACs) are formed to privately raise money to donate to a political campaign in hopes of influencing the election. Super PACs can raise unlimited amounts of money to influence an election, but they are not permitted to donate directly to a campaign” in “Political Action Committee / Super PAC,” Investopedia, accessed October 12, 2018, <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/political-action-committee-super-pac.asp>.

¹¹³ Edward B. Logan and Simon N. Patten Fellow, “Lobbying,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, Vol. 144, Supplement (Jul., 1929): 1, accessed April 10, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1017495>.

¹¹⁴ Lee Drutman, “The Complexities of Lobbying: Toward a Deeper Understanding of the Profession,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 835.

¹¹⁵ Abraham Lincoln, “The Gettysburg Address,” November 19, 1863, *Abraham Lincoln Online*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm>.

¹¹⁶ Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, “What Is This ‘Lobbying’ That We Are so Worried About?” *Yale Law & Policy Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Spring, 2008): 524, accessed February 17, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40239700>.

¹¹⁷ Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, “What Is This ‘Lobbying’ That We Are so Worried About?” *Yale Law & Policy Review*, 486-487.

¹¹⁸ Susan Schmidt and James V. Grimaldi, “The Fast Rise and Steep Fall of Jack Abramoff,” *Washington Post*, December 29, 2005, accessed January 10, 2017, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/28/AR2005122801588_5.html.

¹¹⁹ Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, “What Is This ‘Lobbying’ That We Are so Worried About?” *Yale Law & Policy Review*, 493-494.

¹²⁰ Jane J. Mansbridge, “A Deliberative Theory of Interest Representation,” in *The Politics of Interests: Interest Groups Transformed*, edited by Mark P. Petracca, (Oxford: Westview Press, 1992), 35.

¹²¹ John R. Wright, *Interest Groups and Congress: Lobbying Contributions and Influence* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1996), 9.

¹²² John R. Wright, *Interest Groups and Congress: Lobbying Contributions and Influence*, 24.

¹²³ Lee Drutman, “The Complexities of Lobbying: Toward a Deeper Understanding of the Profession,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 834.

¹²⁴ National Bureau of Economic Research, *Is It Whom You Know or What You Know? An Empirical Assessment of the Lobbying Process*, by Marianne Bertrand, Matilde Bombardini, and

Francesco Trebbi. Working Paper 16765. Cambridge, MA, 2011.

¹²⁵ Lee Drutman, “The Complexities of Lobbying: Toward a Deeper Understanding of the Profession,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 835.

¹²⁶ David Austen-Smith and John R. Wright, “Competitive lobbying for a legislator's vote,” *Social Choice and Welfare*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (1992): 231, accessed July 31, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41106026>.

¹²⁷ Lee Drutman, “The Complexities of Lobbying: Toward a Deeper Understanding of the Profession,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 835.

¹²⁸ Colleen McGuinness, ed., *The Washington Lobby: Fifth Edition* (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1987), 1.

¹²⁹ Colleen McGuinness, ed., *The Washington Lobby: Fifth Edition*, 1-2.

¹³⁰ Colleen McGuinness, ed., *The Washington Lobby: Fifth Edition*, 2.

¹³¹ Madison uses this term to describe what in modern day vernacular would be considered the historical precursors to special interest groups. See James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10,” *The New York Packet* (Friday, November 23, 1787): accessed August 8, 2016, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed10.asp

¹³² Ronald J. Hrebenar and Bryson B. Morgan, *Lobbying in America: A Reference Handbook* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2009), 2.

¹³³ Colleen McGuinness, ed., *The Washington Lobby: Fifth Edition*, 2.

¹³⁴ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹³⁵ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹³⁶ Hrebenar and Morgan, *Lobbying in America*, 1.

¹³⁷ Hrebenar and Morgan, *Lobbying in America*, 5.

¹³⁸ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹³⁹ Mark Goldie and Robert Wokler, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 573.

¹⁴⁰ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁴¹ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁴² James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁴³ Jeffrey M. Berry, *The Interest Group Society: Third Edition* (New York: Longman Inc., 1997), 1.

¹⁴⁴ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁴⁵ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁴⁶ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁴⁷ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁴⁸ Conrad Cherry, ed., *God's New Israel* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 107.

¹⁴⁹ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁵⁰ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁵¹ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁵² James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

¹⁵³ Jeffrey M. Berry, *The Interest Group Society: Third Edition*, 3.

¹⁵⁴ Certain methods of interpreting the Scriptures were used by Christian groups throughout the history of the United States that ultimately led them to the conviction that socio-political action was necessary to make or change public policy. “Hermeneutics has been traditionally defined as the *study of the locus and principles of interpretation*—particularly as it is applied to the interpretation of ancient texts. ... In the case of biblical hermeneutics, it is a jump from the agrarian world in which the redemptive events occurred and were recorded to an industrial or even post-industrial world in which we read the record and live-in faith” in Duncan S. Ferguson, *Biblical Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1986), 4-5. It is this attempt to apply the Scriptures to the context of their respective periods that Christian groups determined in themselves to engage politically. For more information on this concept see Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hermeneutics* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

¹⁵⁵ For examples of ecclesiastical activities around these concerns see Brycchan Carey & Geoffrey Plank, ed., *Quakers & Abolition* (Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014).

¹⁵⁶ The Baptist of Danbury, Connecticut wrote a letter to Thomas Jefferson seeking his support in ensuring religious liberty which ultimately protected their own interests. See “The Papers of Jefferson, Volume 35: 1 August to 30 November 1801,” *Princeton University*, accessed October 12, 2018, <https://jeffersonpapers.princeton.edu/selected-documents/danbury-baptist-association>.

¹⁵⁷ Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Henry Reeve (Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Outlook Verlag GmbH, 2018), 9.

¹⁵⁸ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. J.P. Mayer and trans. George Lawrence (Harper & Row, Publishers: London), 9.

¹⁵⁹ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 10.

¹⁶⁰ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 10.

¹⁶¹ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 10.

¹⁶² Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 10.

¹⁶³ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 34-36.

¹⁶⁴ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 34.

¹⁶⁵ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 36.

¹⁶⁶ Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York: Routledge, 1992), 64. In the broader context of discussing Calvinism, Weber offers this Calvinistic insight as a guiding doctrine in Puritanism.

¹⁶⁷ Conrad Cherry, ed., *God's New Israel* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 55.

¹⁶⁸ Conrad Cherry, ed., *God's New Israel*, 58. For additional information on Puritan perceptions of political engagement in during this period in history see E. Brooks Holifield, *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2003).

¹⁶⁹ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 38.

¹⁷⁰ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 39.

¹⁷¹ Alex De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 10.

¹⁷² Robert Booth Fowler, Allen D. Hertzke, Laura R. Olson, and Kevin R. Den Dulk, *Religion and Politics in America: Faith, Culture, and Strategic Choices* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2010), 3-4.

¹⁷³ To clarify the historical evolution, understanding, and impact of covenant theology in Puritan thought, it is essential to quote Forrer here at length. He writes: "It is sufficient to note that Reformed thinkers in Germany and England—Zwingli, Cocceius, Oecolampadius, Bullinger, Bucer, Tyndale—as well as Calvin in Geneva, were simultaneously developing the idea of the covenant of grace during the early 1500s, that this idea 'became fixed in English theology' during the brief reign of Edward VI, and that by 1585 the notion of a covenant of works made between God and Adam had considerable vogue on the Continent until, by the early decades of the 1600s, it had become a widely accepted tenet of Puritan thought. Such English theologians as Williams Ames, William Perkins, and John Preston further elaborated these two covenants for English Puritanism. Hence, by 1630, when the Puritans sailed aboard the *Arbella* to American wilderness, Puritan thought had developed the notion of covenant into two opposing conceptions of morality, one based on works of human merit, the other on faith or divine grace. This dichotomization of human experience decisively shaped the American Puritan's way of thinking about human experience" in Richard Forrer, *Theodicies in Conflict: A Dilemma In Puritan Ethics and Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 15. As such, Puritans understood themselves as the "New Israel" in a new type of covenantal relationship with God based solely on God's grace through Jesus Christ's redemptive work on the cross. This covenant, furthermore, was verified by the diligence of Puritan piety and labors towards creating a divine socio-political order reflective of the covenantal relationship existent between God and their community.

¹⁷⁴ Locke's celebrated works *Two Treatises of Government* articulates the political philosophers "general philosophical defence of the rights of property-owners to institute and defend a political system based upon their consent... Moreover, Locke's work, and especially the *Second Treatise*, was often characterized as the first secular expression of political theory in the modern era" in Richard Ashcraft, *Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987), 1.

¹⁷⁵ See Richard Ashcraft, *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, 1.

¹⁷⁶ Mark Goldie and Robert Walker ed., *The Cambridge History of the Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 47.

¹⁷⁷ John Witte, Jr. and Joel A. Nicholas, *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment 4th Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 26-27.

¹⁷⁸ See John Witte, Jr. and Joe A. Nicholas, *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment 4th Edition*.

¹⁷⁹ See David A. Weir, *Early New England: A Covenanted Society* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2005), and for information on the Anglican church's role see Warren M. Billings ed., *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of*

Virginia, 1606-1700 (Chapel Hill: University Press of North Carolina, 2007), for information about William Penn and Quaker influence in Pennsylvania see Mary Maples Dunn, *William Penn: Politics and Conscience* (Princeton University: Princeton University Press, 1967).

¹⁸⁰ “First Continental Congress,” UShistory.org, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://www.ushistory.org/declaration/related/congress.html>.

¹⁸¹ John Witte, Jr. and Joel A. Nicholas, *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment 4th Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 65.

¹⁸² “Biographical Data of the United States Congress: 1774-Present,” Congress.gov, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/biosearch/biosearch.asp>. Utilizing this database, meticulous research was done into the professions of the delegates in attendance at both Continental Congresses and the drafting of the Articles of Confederation.

¹⁸³ “Stephen Hopkins,” Brown University, accessed October 16, 2018, https://www.brown.edu/Administration/News_Bureau/Databases/Encyclopedia/search.php?serial=H0240.

¹⁸⁴ “Biographical Data of the United States Congress: 1774-Present,” Congress.gov, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=H000961>.

¹⁸⁵ See Benjamin H. Irvin, *Clothed is Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People out of doors* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011). In this work, Irvin details the participants and events surrounding the Congress; he discloses the methods the founders employed to grasp power and win over public opinion to support their revolutionary activities and political authority.

¹⁸⁶ “Second Continental Congress,” UShistory.org, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://www.ushistory.org/us/10e.asp>.

¹⁸⁷ “Second Continental Congress,” UShistory.org, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://www.ushistory.org/us/10e.asp>

¹⁸⁸ “Biographical Data of the United States Congress: 1774-Present,” Congress.gov, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=F000342>.

¹⁸⁹ “The Articles of Confederation,” Library of Congress, accessed October 16, 2018, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/articles.html>.

¹⁹⁰ “Articles of Confederation: March 1, 1781,” Yale Law School – The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy, accessed October 16, 2018, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/artconf.asp.

¹⁹¹ “Abraham Baldwin: Early Years 1754-1779,” The Georgia Historical Society, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://georgiahistory.com/education-outreach/online-exhibits/featured-historical-figures/abraham-baldwin/baldwin-early-years/>.

¹⁹² “Abraham Baldwin 1754-1807,” New Georgia Encyclopedia, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-archaeology/abraham-baldwin-1754-1807>.

¹⁹³ See Benjamin H. Irvin, *Clothed is Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People out of doors* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011).

¹⁹⁴ Thomas E. Patterson, *The American Democracy: Second Edition*, (New York: McGraw Hill Inc., 1993) 3.

¹⁹⁵ John F. Wilson, “The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, ed. Derek H. Davis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 9.

¹⁹⁶ John Witte, Jr. and Joel A. Nicholas, *Religion and the Constitutional Experiment 4th Edition*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 70.

¹⁹⁷ John Witte, Jr. and Joel A. Nicholas, *Religion and the Constitutional Experiment 4th Edition*, 70.

¹⁹⁸ John F. Wilson, “The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, 10.

¹⁹⁹ John F. Wilson, “The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, 11.

²⁰⁰ John Witte, Jr. and Joel A. Nicholas, *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment 4th Edition*, 72.

²⁰¹ John Witte, Jr. and Joel A. Nicholas, *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment 4th Edition*, 72.

²⁰² James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

²⁰³ James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10.”

²⁰⁴ “United States Constitution Amendment 1 – Freedom of Religion, Press, Expression,” USConstitution.net, accessed October 16, 2018, https://www.usconstitution.net/xconst_Am1.html.

²⁰⁵ For more information on the positions the founders assumed in the United States government see Bruce Ackerman, *The Failure of the Founding Fathers: Jefferson, Marshall, and the Rise of Presidential Democracy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2005).

²⁰⁶ For an insightful article detailing the methods Washington used to consolidate and strengthen federal authority against individual state's authority or rogue political actors see Glen A. Phelps, "George Washington and the Founding of the Presidency," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Bicentennial Issue: The Origins and Invention of the American Presidency (SPRING 1987): 345-363, accessed October 16, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40574456>.

²⁰⁷ John F. Wilson, "The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion," in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, 4.

²⁰⁸ John F. Wilson, "The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion," in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, 4.

²⁰⁹ John F. Wilson, "The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion," in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, 6.

²¹⁰ John F. Wilson, "The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion," in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, 6.

²¹¹ John F. Wilson, "The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion," in *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, 7.

²¹² "The Danbury Baptist Letter to Thomas Jefferson," Separation of Church and State, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://candst.tripod.com/tnppage/baptist.htm>.

²¹³ "The Danbury Baptist Letter to Thomas Jefferson," Separation of Church and State, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://candst.tripod.com/tnppage/baptist.htm>.

²¹⁴ "The Danbury Baptist Letter to Thomas Jefferson," Separation of Church and State, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://candst.tripod.com/tnppage/baptist.htm>.

²¹⁵ "Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists," Library of Congress, accessed October 16, 2018, <https://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html>.

²¹⁶ "Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists," Library of Congress, accessed October 16, 2018, <https://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html>

²¹⁷ "Declaring Independence: Drafting Documents – Jefferson's 'Original Rough Draft' of the Declaration of Independence," Library of Congress, accessed October 20, 2018, <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/declara/ruffdrft.html>.

²¹⁸ Henry Wiencek, "The Dark Side of Thomas Jefferson: A New Portrait of the Founding Father Challenges the Long-held Perception of Thomas Jefferson as a Benevolent Slaveholder," in *Smithsonian Magazine*, October 2012, accessed October 20, 2018, <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/the-dark-side-of-thomas-jefferson-35976004/?page=2>.

²¹⁹ Henry Wiencek, "The Dark Side of Thomas Jefferson: A New Portrait of the Founding Father Challenges the Long-held Perception of Thomas Jefferson as a Benevolent Slaveholder," in *Smithsonian Magazine*, October 2012, accessed July 20, 2017, <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/the-dark-side-of-thomas-jefferson-35976004/?page=2>.

²²⁰ Henry Wiencek, "The Dark Side of Thomas Jefferson: A New Portrait of the Founding Father Challenges the Long-held Perception of Thomas Jefferson as a Benevolent Slaveholder," in *Smithsonian Magazine*, October 2012, accessed July 20, 2017, <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/the-dark-side-of-thomas-jefferson-35976004/>.

²²¹ Henry Wiencek, "The Dark Side of Thomas Jefferson: A New Portrait of the Founding Father Challenges the Long-held Perception of Thomas Jefferson as a Benevolent Slaveholder," in *Smithsonian Magazine*, October 2012, accessed July 20, 2017, <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/the-dark-side-of-thomas-jefferson-35976004/>.

²²² The Quakers frequently challenged George Washington, who was also a slaveholder that benefited tremendously from this enterprise, on his pro-slavery position. See Paul F. Boller, Jr., "George Washington and the Quakers," *Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Autumn 1960): 67-83, accessed October 20, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41944729>.

²²³ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951), 4.

²²⁴ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 2.

²²⁵ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 2.

²²⁶ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 2.

²²⁷ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 2.

²²⁸ Manisha Sinha, *The Slaves Cause: A History of Abolition*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), p. 4.

²²⁹ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 3.

²³⁰ This anti-slavery position is in accord with the thinking of the founder of Methodism, John Wesley, who in 1774 published a work entitled, *Thoughts upon Slavery*, which condemned the slavery as a practice.

²³¹ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 5.

²³² "The Kansas-Nebraska Act," The United States Senate, accessed October 20, 2018, https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/minute/Kansas_Nebraska_Act.htm.

²³³ "The Kansas-Nebraska Act," The United States Senate, accessed October 20, 2018, https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/minute/Kansas_Nebraska_Act.htm. To clarify, "In an effort to preserve the balance of power in Congress between slave and free states, the Missouri Compromise was passed in 1820 admitting Missouri as a slave state and Maine as a free state. Furthermore, apart from Missouri, this law prohibited slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of the 36° 30' latitude line. In 1854, the Missouri Compromise was repealed by the Kansas-Nebraska Act," quoted in "Missouri Compromise," Library of Congress, accessed October 20, 2018, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/missouri.html>.

²³⁴ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 5.

²³⁵ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 4.

²³⁶ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 4.

²³⁷ "Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society," Teaching American History, accessed June 7, 2021, <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/constitution-of-the-american-anti-slavery-society/>.

²³⁸ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 5.

²³⁹ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 5-6.

²⁴⁰ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 8.

²⁴¹ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 6.

²⁴² Riggins R. Earl, Jr., *Dark Symbols, Obscure Signs: God, Self, and Community in the Slave Mind* (New York: Orbis Books, 1993), 24.

²⁴³ Riggins R. Earl, Jr., *Dark Symbols, Obscure Signs: God, Self, and Community in the Slave Mind*, 35.

²⁴⁴ John W. Blassingame, ed., *The Frederick Douglass Papers: Series One: Speeches, Debates and Interviews, Volume 2, 1847-54* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 12.

²⁴⁵ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 8.

²⁴⁶ "The origins of the Southern Baptist Convention: a historiographical study: the purpose of this paper is to describe how white Baptist church historians of the South have interpreted the founding of the Southern Baptist Convention since 1845," The Free Online Library, accessed October 16, 2017, <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/The+origins+of+the+Southern+Baptist+Convention%3A+a+historiographical...-a094160891>.

²⁴⁷ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 8.

²⁴⁸ See "Resolution On Racial Reconciliation On The 150th Anniversary Of The Southern Baptist Convention - Atlanta, Georgia - 1995," Southern Baptist Convention, accessed October 16, 2018, <http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/899/resolution-on-racial-reconciliation-on-the-150th-anniversary-of-the-southern-baptist-convention>.

²⁴⁹ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), xi-xii.

²⁵⁰ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, xi-xii.

²⁵¹ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 3.

²⁵² Manisha Sinha, *The Slaves Cause: A History of Abolition*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), p. 25.

²⁵³ Manisha Sinha, *The Slave Cause: A History of Abolition*, 3.

²⁵⁴ Daniel Alexander Payne, *Recollection of Seventy Years*, (Nashville, Tennessee: Publishing House of the A.M.E. Sunday School Union, 1888), 27-28, Documenting the South, University of North Carolina, accessed July 4, 2018, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/church/payne70/payne.html>.

²⁵⁵ Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave*, (Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, No. 25 Cornhill, 1845) xiii.

²⁵⁶ Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave*, 36.

²⁵⁷ Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave*, 36.

²⁵⁸ Ben Schiller, "Learning Their Letters: Critical Literacy, Epistolary Culture, and Slavery in the Antebellum South," *Southern Quarterly* 45.3 (2008): 12, accessed October 20, 2018, http://www.academia.edu/1283185/Learning_their_letters_Critical_literacy_epistolary_culture_and_slavery_in_the_Antebellum_South.

²⁵⁹ Ben Schiller, "Learning Their Letters: Critical Literacy, Epistolary Culture, and Slavery in the Antebellum South," *Southern Quarterly* 45.3 (2008): 12.

²⁶⁰ Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave*, 124.

²⁶¹ "Free Blacks in the Antebellum Period," African American Odyssey Library of Congress, accessed October 20, 2018, <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/aahtml/exhibit/aopart2.html>.

²⁶² Samuel E. Cornish and Theodore S. Wright, *The Colonization Scheme Considered in Its Rejection by the Colored People—In Its Tendency to Uphold Castes—In Its Unfitness for Christianizing and Civilizing the Aborigines of Africa and Putting a Stop to the African Slave Trade: In a Letter to the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen and the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler* (Newark: Printed by Aaron Guest, 1840), 4, accessed October 16, 2018, <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=FPpxAAAAMAAJ&hl=de&printsec=frontcover&pg=GBS.P1>.

²⁶³ Samuel E. Cornish and Theodore S. Wright, *The Colonization Scheme Considered in Its Rejection by the Colored People—In Its Tendency to Uphold Castes—In Its Unfitness for Christianizing and Civilizing the Aborigines of Africa and Putting a Stop to the African Slave Trade: In a Letter to the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen and the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler*, 3.

²⁶⁴ Samuel E. Cornish and Theodore S. Wright, *The Colonization Scheme Considered in Its Rejection by the Colored People—In Its Tendency to Uphold Castes—In Its Unfitness for Christianizing and Civilizing the Aborigines of Africa and Putting a Stop to the African Slave Trade: In a Letter to the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen and the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler*, 5.

²⁶⁵ Samuel E. Cornish and Theodore S. Wright, *The Colonization Scheme Considered in Its Rejection by the Colored People—In Its Tendency to Uphold Castes—In Its Unfitness for Christianizing and Civilizing the Aborigines of Africa and Putting a Stop to the African Slave Trade: In a Letter to the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen and the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler*, 8.

²⁶⁶ "Freedom's Journal (1827-1829)," BlackPast.org, accessed June 30, 2017, <http://www.blackpast.org/aah/freedom-s-journal-1827-1829#sthash.DSdDEVVF.dpuf>

²⁶⁷ Winston James, *The Struggles of John Brown Russwurm: The Life and Writings of a Pan-Africanist Pioneer, 1799-1851*, (New York: New York University Press, 2010), 28.

²⁶⁸ "Freedom's Journal (1827-1829)," BlackPast.org, accessed June 30, 2017, <http://www.blackpast.org/aah/freedom-s-journal-1827-1829#sthash.DSdDEVVF.dpuf>.

²⁶⁹ Winston James, *The Struggles of John Brown Russwurm: The Life and Writings of a Pan-Africanist Pioneer, 1799-1851*, 29.

²⁷⁰ Elliot P. Skinner, *African Americans and U.S. Policy Toward Africa 1850-1924: In Defense of Black Nationality* (Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1992), 21.

²⁷¹ Elliot P. Skinner, *African Americans and U.S. Policy Toward Africa 1850-1924: In Defense of Black Nationality*, 48-49.

²⁷² Raphael G. Warnock, *The Divided Mind of the Black Church: Theology, Piety and Public Witness*, (New York: New York University Press, 2014), 92.

²⁷³ Abraham Lincoln, *Selected Speeches and Writings* (New York, NY: First Library of America Paperback Classics, 2009), 101.

²⁷⁴ See Abraham Lincoln, *Selected Speeches and Writings*, 108-114.

²⁷⁵ Abraham Lincoln, *Selected Speeches and Writings*, 108.

²⁷⁶ Abraham Lincoln, *Selected Speeches and Writings*, 149.

²⁷⁷ Abraham Lincoln, *Selected Speeches and Writings*, 149.

²⁷⁸ Abraham Lincoln, *Selected Speeches and Writings*, 190.

²⁷⁹ Rebecca Caesar, "University of Rochester Frederick Douglass Project: Frederick Douglass Relationship with Abraham Lincoln," University of Rochester River Campus Libraries, accessed July 3, 2017, <http://rbscp.lib.rochester.edu/4071>.

²⁸⁰ Rebecca Caesar, "University of Rochester Frederick Douglass Project: Frederick Douglass Relationship with Abraham Lincoln," University of Rochester River Campus Libraries, accessed July 3, 2017, <http://rbscp.lib.rochester.edu/4071>.

²⁸¹ James W. Loewen, "Five Myths About Why the South Seceded," *Washington Post*, February 6, 2011, accessed July 7, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/five-myths-about-why-the-south-seceded/2011/01/03/ABHr6jD_story.html?utm_term=.5f1fc412292e.

²⁸² Gerald Grunderson, "The Origin of the American Civil War," *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Dec., 1974): 923, accessed November 2, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2116615>.

²⁸³ "Timeline of the American Civil War," British Library, accessed July 7, 2017, <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/uscivilwar/timeline/timelinecivilwar.html>.

- ²⁸⁴ Philip S. Foner, *The Life and Writing of Frederick Douglass, Volume III* (New York: The International Publishing Company, Inc., 1950), 152.
- ²⁸⁵ “Lincoln and Frederick Douglass - With Malice Toward None: The Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Exhibition,” The Library of Congress, accessed July 3, 2017, <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/lincoln/lincoln-and-frederick-douglass.html>.
- ²⁸⁶ “Timeline of the American Civil War,” British Library, accessed July 7, 2017, <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/uscivilwar/timeline/timelinecivilwar.html>.
- ²⁸⁷ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013, accessed July 3, 2017, <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/08/09/when-douglass-met-lincoln/>.
- ²⁸⁸ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁸⁹ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁹⁰ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁹¹ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁹² Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁹³ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁹⁴ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁹⁵ Rick Beard, “When Douglass Met Lincoln,” *New York Times*, August 9, 2013.
- ²⁹⁶ Daniel Alexander Payne, *Recollections of Seventy Years*, (Nashville, Tennessee: Publishing House of the A.M.E. Sunday School Union, 1888), 146-147, accessed July 8, 2017, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Documenting the South, <http://docsouth.unc.edu/church/payne70/payne.html>.
- ²⁹⁷ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), iii.
- ²⁹⁸ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 1.
- ²⁹⁹ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 30.
- ³⁰⁰ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 31.
- ³⁰¹ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 31.
- ³⁰² United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 36-37.
- ³⁰³ Andrew Johnson, “Veto of the Civil Rights Bill, March 27, 1866,” *Andrew Johnson, His Life and Speeches*, by Lillian Foster (New York: Richardson & Company, 1866), accessed July 11, 2017, <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/veto-of-the-civil-rights-bill/>.
- ³⁰⁴ “14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution,” The Library of Congress, accessed July 11, 2017, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/14thamendment.html>.
- ³⁰⁵ “14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution,” The Library of Congress, accessed July 11, 2017, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/14thamendment.html>.
- ³⁰⁶ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 52.
- ³⁰⁷ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 52.
- ³⁰⁸ Walter L. Fleming, “Forty Acres and a Mule,” *The North American Review*, Vol. 182, No. 594 (May, 1906): 725, accessed July 12, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25105565>.
- ³⁰⁹ Walter L. Fleming, “Forty Acres and a Mule,” *The North American Review*, Vol. 182, No. 594 (May, 1906): 726.
- ³¹⁰ Walter L. Fleming, “Forty Acres and a Mule,” *The North American Review*, Vol. 182, No. 594 (May, 1906): 728.
- ³¹¹ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 38.
- ³¹² United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 50.
- ³¹³ Melvin I. Urofsky, “Jim Crow law: United States [1877-1945],” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, accessed July 11, 2017, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Jim-Crow-law>.
- ³¹⁴ Yohuru Williams, *Black Politics/White Power: Civil Rights, Black Power, and the Black Panthers in New Haven*, (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2008) ix.

- ³¹⁵ United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 6.
- ³¹⁶ Benjamin E. Mays, *Born to Rebel, An Autobiography* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971) 4.
- ³¹⁷ Mark Newman, *The Civil Rights Movement* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 34.
- ³¹⁸ Jeffrey M. Berry, *The Interest Group Society: Third Edition* (New York: Longman, Inc., 1997), 6.
- ³¹⁹ "Lobbying," United States Senate, accessed August 19, 2016, http://www.senate.gov/reference/reference_index_subjects/Lobbying_vrd.htm.
- ³²⁰ Dorothy K. Newman, Nancy J. Amidei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Krivant, and Jack S. Russell, *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940-75*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 14-15.
- ³²¹ Dorothy K. Newman, Nancy J. Amidei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Krivant, and Jack S. Russell, *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940-75*, 15.
- ³²² "The Nation's Premier Civil Rights Organization," NAACP, accessed November 7, 2018, <https://www.naacp.org/nations-premier-civil-rights-organization/>.
- ³²³ George C. Herring, *From Colony To Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 682.
- ³²⁴ Dorothy K. Newman, Nancy J. Amidei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Krivant, and Jack S. Russell, *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940-75*, 16.
- ³²⁵ Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, "What Is This 'Lobbying' That We Are so Worried About?" *Yale Law & Policy Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Spring, 2008): 486, accessed February 17, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40239700>.
- ³²⁶ Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1958), 91-98.
- ³²⁷ Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, 91
- ³²⁸ Henry David Thoreau, *Civil Disobedience* (1849), 16.
- ³²⁹ Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, 91.
- ³³⁰ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), 252.
- ³³¹ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 252.
- ³³² Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, 96-97.
- ³³³ Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, p. 97.
- ³³⁴ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 242.
- ³³⁵ See Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*.
- ³³⁶ Local clergy founded this organization to coordinate their grass roots efforts, with Dr. King serving as its president.
- ³³⁷ Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, 51.
- ³³⁸ Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, 51.
- ³³⁹ Mark Newman, *The Civil Rights Movement*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 58-59.
- ³⁴⁰ "SCLC History," Southern Christian Leadership Conference, accessed July 23, 2018, <http://nationalsclc.org/about-us/history/>.
- ³⁴¹ Mark Newman, *The Civil Rights Movement*, 59.
- ³⁴² Dorothy K. Newman, Nancy J. Amidei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Krivant, and Jack S. Russell, *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940-75*, 19.
- ³⁴³ Clarence Taylor, *Black Religious Intellectuals: The Fight for Equality from Jim Crow to the 21st Century*, (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2002), 38.
- ³⁴⁴ Clarence Taylor, *Black Religious Intellectuals: The Fight for Equality from Jim Crow to the 21st Century*, 38.
- ³⁴⁵ Dorothy K. Newman, Nancy J. Amidei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Krivant, and Jack S. Russell, *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940-75*, 20.
- ³⁴⁶ Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 178.

- ³⁴⁷ Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*, 179.
- ³⁴⁸ Dorothy K. Newman, Nancy J. Amidei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Krivant, and Jack S. Russell, *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940-75*, 20.
- ³⁴⁹“The Civil Rights Act of 1964: The Long Struggle for Freedom,” The Library of Congress, accessed July 26, 2017, <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/civil-rights-act/civil-rights-act-of-1964.html>.
- ³⁵⁰ Michael Corbett and Julia Mitchell Corbett, *Politics and Religion in the United States* (New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999), 8.
- ³⁵¹ Michael Corbett and Julia Mitchell Corbett, *Politics and Religion in the United States*, 8.
- ³⁵² Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers* (Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press, 1995), 3.
- ³⁵³ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 4-5.
- ³⁵⁴ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 6-7.
- ³⁵⁵ See Charles Roy Keller, *The Second Great Awakening in Connecticut* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942).
- ³⁵⁶ Donald G. Matthews, “The Second Great Awakening as an Organizing Process, 1780-1830: An Hypothesis,” *American Quarterly* Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring, 1969): 23, accessed August 22, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2710771>.
- ³⁵⁷ Joseph Conforti, “The Invention of the Great Awakening, 1795-1842,” *Early American Literature* Vol. 26, No. 2 (1991), 99, accessed August 23, 2021, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25056853>.
- ³⁵⁸ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 28.
- ³⁵⁹ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 18-19.
- ³⁶⁰ William R. Sutton, “Benevolent Calvinism and the Moral Government of God: The Influence of Nathaniel W. Taylor on Revivalism in the Second Great Awakening,” *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter, 1992), 23, accessed August 23, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1124013>.
- ³⁶¹ William R. Sutton, “Benevolent Calvinism and the Moral Government of God: The Influence of Nathaniel W. Taylor on Revivalism in the Second Great Awakening,” *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter, 1992), 24.
- ³⁶² Richard D. Shiels, “The Second Great Awakening in Connecticut: Critique of the Traditional Interpretation,” *Church History* Vol. 49, No. 4 (Dec., 1980), 401, accessed August 25, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3164815>.
- ³⁶³ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 57.
- ³⁶⁴ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 57.
- ³⁶⁵ Michael Corbett and Julia Mitchell Corbett, *Politics and Religion in the United States*, 91.
- ³⁶⁶ Andrew F. Walls, *The Missionary Movement In Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*, (New York: Orbis Books Maryknoll, 1996), 232.
- ³⁶⁷ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, xix.
- ³⁶⁸ Robert P. Swierenga, *Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s*, ed. Mark A. Noll (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 149.
- ³⁶⁹ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 69.
- ³⁷⁰ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 76.
- ³⁷¹ Steven Mintz, *Moralists & Modernizers*, 76.
- ³⁷² Horace Mann, “Lectures on Education,” *Schools: Studies in Education*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Fall 2009), 226, accessed August 23, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1086/605997>.
- ³⁷³ David Masci, “Darwinism in America: The evolution debate in the United States,” Pew Research Center, February 6, 2019, accessed September 3, 2021, <https://www.pewforum.org/essay/darwin-in-america/>.
- ³⁷⁴ David Masci, “Darwinism in America: The evolution debate in the United States,” Pew Research Center, February 6, 2019, accessed September 3, 2021.
- ³⁷⁵ Frederick C. Giffin, “Billy Sunday: The Evangelist as ‘Patriot,’” *Social Science* Vol. 48, No. 4 (Autumn 1973), 217, accessed September 4, 2021, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41959648>.
- ³⁷⁶ Frederick C. Giffin, “Billy Sunday: The Evangelist as ‘Patriot,’” *Social Science* Vol. 48, No. 4 (Autumn 1973), 217.
- ³⁷⁷ Frederick C. Giffin, “Billy Sunday: The Evangelist as ‘Patriot,’” *Social Science* Vol. 48, No. 4 (Autumn 1973), 217.
- ³⁷⁸ David Masci, “Darwinism in America: The evolution debate in the United States,” Pew Research Center, February 6, 2019, accessed September 3, 2021.

³⁷⁹ “History – National Association of Evangelicals,” National Association of Evangelicals, accessed September 4, 2021, <https://www.nae.net/about-nae/history/>.

³⁸⁰ “History – National Association of Evangelicals,” National Association of Evangelicals, accessed September 4, 2021.

³⁸¹ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 13.

³⁸² Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, 12.

³⁸³ Patrick W. Carey, *The Roman Catholics*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993), 34.

³⁸⁴ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, 16.

³⁸⁵ Patrick W. Carey, *The Roman Catholics*, 43.

³⁸⁶ Patrick W. Carey, *The Roman Catholics*, 43.

³⁸⁷ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, 24.

Chapter 2

³⁸⁸ William R. Stevenson, Jr. ed., *Christian Political Activism at Crossroads* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1994), 96.

³⁸⁹ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful: Religious advocacy groups in Washington, D.C.*, 58.

³⁹⁰ There are two main tax statuses under which the CLOs for this study fall. They are 501 (c) (3) or 501 (c) (4). The prior status, of which most are designated in this study, forbids any kind of participation in political campaigns, while the latter seriously limits the methods in which an organization can support a given candidate. On 501 (c) (3) see Internal Revenue Service ““The Restriction of Political Campaign Intervention by Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Organizations,” last modified November 5, 2018, accessed November 14, 2018, <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/the-restriction-of-political-campaign-intervention-by-section-501c3-tax-exempt-organizations>; and for 501 (c) (4) see B. Holly Schadler, *The Connection: Strategies for Creating and Operating 501(c)(3)s, 501(c)(4)s and Political Organizations Third Edition*, (Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Justice, 2012), accessed November 14, 2018, https://www.bolderadvocacy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/The_Connection.pdf.

³⁹¹ John Wagner and Sarah Pulliam Bailey, “Trump signs order seeking to allow churches to engage in more political activity,” *Washington Post*, May 4, 2017, accessed July 20, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-signs-order-aimed-at-allowing-churches-to-engage-in-more-political-activity/2017/05/04/024ed7c2-30d3-11e7-9534-00e4656c22aa_story.html?utm_term=.63c506ca501e.

³⁹² Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful: Religious advocacy groups in Washington, D.C.*, 57.

³⁹³ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 97.

³⁹⁴ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 97.

³⁹⁵ “Government Relations,” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed October 9, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/about/government-relations/>.

³⁹⁶ “USCCB Mission: General Mission Goals of the USCCB,” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed October 9, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/about/usccb-mission.cfm>.

³⁹⁷ “The United Methodist Church” Church & Society: The United Methodist Church, accessed October 9, 2017, <https://www.umcjustice.org/who-we-are/the-united-methodist-church>.

³⁹⁸ “Social Principles and Resolutions,” Church & Society: The United Methodist Church, accessed October 9, 2017, <https://www.umcjustice.org/who-we-are/social-principles-and-resolutions>.

³⁹⁹ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 98.

⁴⁰⁰ “About Us: History and Mission,” Bread for the World, accessed October 9, 2017, <http://www.bread.org/history-mission>.

⁴⁰¹ “About Us: History and Mission,” Bread for the World, accessed October 9, 2017.

⁴⁰² “About Us: History and Mission,” Bread for the World, accessed October 9, 2017.

⁴⁰³ “About Us,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed October 9, 2017, <https://concernedwomen.org/about/>.

⁴⁰⁴ “About Us,” Concerned Women for America, accessed October 9, 2017.

⁴⁰⁵ “About Us,” Concerned Women for America, accessed October 9, 2017.

⁴⁰⁶ “About Us,” Concerned Women for America, accessed October 9, 2017.

-
- ⁴⁰⁷ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 99-100.
- ⁴⁰⁸ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 100.
- ⁴⁰⁹ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 101.
- ⁴¹⁰ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 98.
- ⁴¹¹ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 98.
- ⁴¹² Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 99.
- ⁴¹³ Robert Zwier, “An organizational perspective on religious interest groups,” in *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, ed. W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 99.
- ⁴¹⁴ Advocacy is defined here as, “Intentional acts of witness by the body of Christ that hold people and institutions accountable for creating, implementing, and sustaining just and good policies and practices geared toward the flourishing of society. Transformational advocacy challenges injustice and obstacles to human flourishing at whatever level it is practiced by humbly engaging with people who can address the wrong, trusting God’s Spirit to change all those involved as well as the institutions themselves,” in Stephen Offutt, F. David Bronkema, Krisanne Vaillancourt Murphy, Robb Davis, and Gregg Okesson, *Advocating for Justice: An Evangelical Vision for Transforming Systems and Structures* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2016), 11-12. On this term see also Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997); and Joseph C. Hough Jr., “Christian Social Ethics as Advocacy,” *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Spring, 1977): 115-133, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40020366>.
- ⁴¹⁵ “Government Relations,” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴¹⁶ “Government Relations,” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴¹⁷ “Government Relations,” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴¹⁸ “Government Relations,” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴¹⁹ “Our Mission Statement and Our Work,” Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs (LOGA), accessed October 16, 2017, <https://www.loga.org/mission.html>.
- ⁴²⁰ “Office of Public Witness,” Presbyterian Church U.S.A.: Presbyterian Mission, accessed October 16, 2017, <https://www.presbyterianmission.org/ministries/compassion-peace-justice/washington/>.
- ⁴²¹ “The Office of Government Relations,” The Episcopal Church, accessed October 16, 2017, <https://www.episcopalchurch.org/office-government-relations>.
- ⁴²² “About Us: History and Mission,” Bread for the World, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴²³ “Our Mission,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed October 16, 2017, <https://concernedwomen.org/about/vision-mission/>.
- ⁴²⁴ “Government Relations,” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴²⁵ “Advocacy,” The Evangelical Lutheran Church of America: God’s Work. Our Hands., accessed October 16, 2017, <http://www.elca.org/Our-Work/Publicly-Engaged-Church/Advocacy>.
- ⁴²⁶ “Office of Public Witness,” Presbyterian Church U.S.A.: Presbyterian Mission, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴²⁷ “The Office of Government Relations,” The Episcopal Church, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴²⁸ “About Us: History and Mission,” Bread for the World, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴²⁹ “Advocacy,” The Evangelical Lutheran Church of America: God’s Work. Our Hands., accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴³⁰ “About Us: History and Mission,” Bread for the World, accessed October 16, 2017.
- ⁴³¹ Jean Jacques Rousseau contends “the general will is simply what the citizens of the state have decided together in their sovereign assembly,” in “John Jacques Rousseau,” by Christopher Bertram, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta ed., accessed November 8, 2018, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rousseau/#IdeaGeneWill>.

- ⁴³² “U.S. Constitution: First Amendment,” Cornell Law School: Legal Information Institute, accessed October 18, 2017, https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/first_amendment.
- ⁴³³ Michael Novak, *Social Justice: Not What You Think It Is* (Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation, 2009), 5, accessed October 18, 2017, <http://www.heritage.org/poverty-and-inequality/report/social-justice-not-what-you-think-it>.
- ⁴³⁴ Michael Novak, *Social Justice: Not What You Think It Is* (Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation, 2009), 5.
- ⁴³⁵ Thomas A. Spragens, Jr., “The Antinomies of Social Justice,” *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Spring, 1993): 193, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1407878>.
- ⁴³⁶ See “Social Justice,” Liverpool City Council, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au/community/social-justice>; see “Social Justice,” Center of Leadership Equity and Research, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://clearvoz.com/social-justice/>; and Diana Lee, “Assessing the Relationship Between Gun Violence and Health Equity,” Bethune-Cookman University, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.cookman.edu/newsInfo/newsroom/newsReleases/2016/assessing-the-relationship-between-gun-violence-and-health-equity.html>.
- ⁴³⁷ “What is Social Justice?,” Pachamama, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.pachamama.org/social-justice/what-is-social-justice>.
- ⁴³⁸ “Defining Economic Justice and Social Justice,” The Center for Economic and Social Justice, accessed October 18, 2017, <http://www.cesj.org/learn/definitions/defining-economic-justice-and-social-justice/>.
- ⁴³⁹ Michael Novak, *Social Justice: Not What You Think It Is* (Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation, 2009), 5, accessed October 18, 2017.
- ⁴⁴⁰ Holger Bonus, “On Social Justice,” *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft / Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, Bd. 138, H. 3., Social Policy in a Free Market Economy: A Symposium (September 1982): 599, accessed October 18, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40750554>.
- ⁴⁴¹ “Who We Are,” Sojourners, accessed October 19, 2017, <https://sojo.net/about-us/who-we-are>.
- ⁴⁴² Charles F. Hall, “The Christian Left: Who Are They and How They Are Different from the Christian Right?” *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Sep. 1997): 28, accessed October 19, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3512477>.
- ⁴⁴³ Charles F. Hall, “The Christian Left: Who Are They and How They Are Different from the Christian Right?” *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Sep. 1997): 28.
- ⁴⁴⁴ “Who We Are,” Sojourners, accessed October 19, 2017.
- ⁴⁴⁵ For a wide-ranging discussion on Kingdom theology, see George Elden Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959); Walter Rauschenbusch, *Dare We Be Christians* (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1914); Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1917).
- ⁴⁴⁶ Charles F. Hall, “The Christian Left: Who Are They and How They Are Different from the Christian Right?” *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Sep. 1997): 29.
- ⁴⁴⁷ Charles F. Hall, “The Christian Left: Who Are They and How They Are Different from the Christian Right?” *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Sep. 1997): 29.
- ⁴⁴⁸ Bruce Ellis Benson and Peter Goodwin Heltzel, eds., *Evangelicals and Empire: Christian Alternatives to the Political Status Quo*, (Grand Rapid, Michigan: Brazos Press, 2008), 32.
- ⁴⁴⁹ Charles F. Hall, “The Christian Left: Who Are They and How They Are Different from the Christian Right?” *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Sep. 1997): 29.
- ⁴⁵⁰ “Who We Are,” Sojourners, accessed October 19, 2017.
- ⁴⁵¹ “What We Cover,” Sojourners, accessed October 20, 2017, <https://sojo.net/about-us/what-we-cover>.
- ⁴⁵² Preferential option of the poor roots can be traced back to Catholic Social Teaching; for an insightful work on this topic see Daniel G. and Gustavo A. Gutierrez, eds., *The Preferential Option for the Poor Beyond Theology* (Notre Dame, IL: University of Notre Dame Press, 2014).
- ⁴⁵³ Kira Dault, “What is the preferential option for the poor?,” *U.S. Catholic Magazine: Faith In Real Life*, January 2015, accessed October 20, 2017, <http://www.uscatholic.org/articles/201501/what-preferential-option-poor-29649>.
- ⁴⁵⁴ “What We Cover,” Sojourners, accessed October 20, 2017.
- ⁴⁵⁵ “What We Cover,” Sojourners, accessed October 20, 2017.
- ⁴⁵⁶ Jim Wallis, *God’s Politics: Why the Right Gets It Wrong and The Left Doesn’t Get It* (San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 2005), 4.

-
16. ⁴⁵⁷ Jim Wallis, *God's Politics: Why the Right Gets It Wrong and The Left Doesn't Get It*, 15-16.
- ⁴⁵⁸ "Who We Are," Sojourners, accessed October 19, 2017.
- ⁴⁵⁹ Hope Watson, "Washington gathering empowers a new generation for social justice," Bread for the World Blog, June 23, 2016, accessed October 18, 2017, <http://www.bread.org/blog/washington-gathering-empowers-new-generation-social-justice>.
- ⁴⁶⁰ "History of the Family Research Council: Over Thirty Years of Advancing Faith, Family, and Freedom" Family Research Council, accessed October 29, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/historymission>.
- ⁴⁶¹ "About Focus on the Family," Focus on the Family: Helping Families Thrive, accessed October 29, 2017, <http://www.focusonthefamily.com/about>.
- ⁴⁶² "About Focus on the Family," Focus on the Family: Helping Families Thrive, accessed October 29, 2017.
- ⁴⁶³ "History of the Family Research Council: Over Thirty Years of Advancing Faith, Family, and Freedom" Family Research Council, accessed October 29, 2017.
- ⁴⁶⁴ "History of the Family Research Council: Over Thirty Years of Advancing Faith, Family, and Freedom" Family Research Council, accessed October 29, 2017.
- ⁴⁶⁵ "History of the Family Research Council: Over Thirty Years of Advancing Faith, Family, and Freedom" Family Research Council, accessed October 29, 2017.
- ⁴⁶⁶ "History of the Family Research Council: Over Thirty Years of Advancing Faith, Family, and Freedom" Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁶⁷ "History of the Family Research Council: Over Thirty Years of Advancing Faith, Family, and Freedom" Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁶⁸ "Vision and Mission Statements," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/mission-statement>.
- ⁴⁶⁹ "Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/Life>.
- ⁴⁷⁰ "Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017.
- ⁴⁷¹ "Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017.
- ⁴⁷² "Abortion," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/abortion>.
- ⁴⁷³ "Marriage and Family," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/Marriage-and-Family>.
- ⁴⁷⁴ "Marriage and Family," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017.
- ⁴⁷⁵ "Homosexuality," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/homosexuality>.
- ⁴⁷⁶ "Family Structure," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/family-structure>.
- ⁴⁷⁷ "Human Sexuality," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/human-sexuality>.
- ⁴⁷⁸ "Human Sexuality," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017.
- ⁴⁷⁹ "Human Sexuality," Family Research Council, accessed October 27, 2017.
- ⁴⁸⁰ "Pornography," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/pornography>.
- ⁴⁸¹ "Pornography," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁸² "Pornography," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁸³ "Pornography and Its Consequences," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/pornographyconsequences>.
- ⁴⁸⁴ "Religion in Public Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/religion-in-public-life>.
- ⁴⁸⁵ "Religion in Public Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁸⁶ "Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁸⁷ "Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁸⁸ "Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁸⁹ "Life," Family Research Council, accessed October 30, 2017.
- ⁴⁹⁰ "Our Issues," Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed October 30, 2017, <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/>.
- ⁴⁹¹ "Foundational Values," Focus on the Family: Helping Families Thrive, accessed November 4, 2017, <http://www.focusonthefamily.com/about/foundational-values>.

-
- ⁴⁹² Andreas Kostenberger, "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and Family," Family Research Council, accessed November 4, 2017, <http://www.frc.org/brochure/the-bibles-teaching-on-marriage-and-family>.
- ⁴⁹³ "Our Mission," Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed November 5, 2017, <https://concernedwomen.org/about/vision-mission/>.
- ⁴⁹⁴ "About Us," Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed November 5, 2017. <https://concernedwomen.org/about/>.
- ⁴⁹⁵ "Who We Are: Putting Families First," Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed November 5, 2017, <https://concernedwomen.org/about/who-we-are/>.
- ⁴⁹⁶ Andreas Kostenberger, "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and Family," Family Research Council, accessed November 4, 2017.
- ⁴⁹⁷ Andreas Kostenberger, "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and Family," Family Research Council, accessed November 4, 2017.
- ⁴⁹⁸ Andreas Kostenberger, "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and Family," Family Research Council, accessed November 4, 2017.
- ⁴⁹⁹ "United States Constitution: Preamble," Cornell Law School: Legal Information Institute, accessed November 6, 2017, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/preamble>.
- ⁵⁰⁰ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 23.
- ⁵⁰¹ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), 9.
- ⁵⁰² Harvey Graeme Furbay, "The Anti-Saloon League," *The North American Review* Vol. 177, No. 562 (Sep., 1903), 434, accessed September 5, 2021, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25119451>.
- ⁵⁰³ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 9-10.
- ⁵⁰⁴ Harvey Graeme Furbay, "The Anti-Saloon League," *The North American Review* Vol. 177, No. 562 (Sep., 1903), 434, accessed September 5, 2021.
- ⁵⁰⁵ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 10.
- ⁵⁰⁶ J. C. Jackson, "The Work of the Anti-Saloon League," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 32, Regulation of the Liquor Traffic (Nov., 1908), 12, accessed September 5, 2021, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1010548>.
- ⁵⁰⁷ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 11-12.
- ⁵⁰⁸ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 23.
- ⁵⁰⁹ Henry E. Fritz, "The Making of Grants Peace Policy" in *The Chronicles of Oklahoma*, Volume 37, No. 4 (1959): 413, accessed July 25, 2017, <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Chronicles/v037/v037p411.pdf>.
- ⁵¹⁰ See Henry E. Fritz, "The Making of Grants Peace Policy" in *The Chronicles of Oklahoma*, Volume 37, No. 4 (1959): 414.
- ⁵¹¹ Henry E. Fritz, "The Making of Grants Peace Policy" in *The Chronicles of Oklahoma*, Volume 37, No. 4 (1959): 413.
- ⁵¹² Charles Ewing, *Publications of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, January 1879*, (Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1874), 3, accessed July 25, 2017, <https://archive.org/stream/publicationsofbu00bure#page/n5/mode/2up>.
- ⁵¹³ Charles Ewing, *Publications of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, January 1879*, 4.
- ⁵¹⁴ Charles Ewing, *Publications of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, January 1879*, 10.
- ⁵¹⁵ Charles Ewing, *Publications of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, January 1879*, 11.
- ⁵¹⁶ Charles Ewing, *Publications of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, January 1879*, 11.
- ⁵¹⁷ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 23.
- ⁵¹⁸ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*, 23.
- ⁵¹⁹ Zoë Robinson, "Lobbying in the Shadows: Religious Interests Groups in the Legislative Process," *Emory Law Journal* Vol. 64 (2015): 1051, accessed September 11, 2017, http://law.emory.edu/elj/_documents/volumes/64/4/articles/robinson.pdf.
- ⁵²⁰ "History," National Council of Churches, accessed September 5, 2021, <https://nationalcouncilofchurches.us/about-us/history/>.
- ⁵²¹ "Social Creed," National Council of Churches, accessed September 5, 2021, <https://nationalcouncilofchurches.us/common-witness/1908/social-creed.php>.
- ⁵²² Henry J. Pratt, "The Growth of Political Activism in the National Council of Churches," *The Review of Politics* Vol. 34, No. 3 (Jul., 1972), 328, accessed September 5, 2021, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/140649>.
- ⁵²³ Henry J. Pratt, "The Growth of Political Activism in the National Council of Churches," *The Review of Politics* Vol. 34, No. 3 (Jul., 1972), 327, accessed September 5, 2021.

- ⁵²⁴ Elizabeth Fones-Wolf and Ken Fones-Wolf, “Lending a Hand to Labor: James Myers and the Federal Council of Churches,” 1926-1947, *Church History* Vol. 68, No. 1 (Mar., 1999), 81, accessed September 5, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3170110>.
- ⁵²⁵ Elizabeth Fones-Wolf and Ken Fones-Wolf, “Lending a Hand to Labor: James Myers and the Federal Council of Churches,” 1926-1947, *Church History* Vol. 68, No. 1 (Mar., 1999), 82, accessed September 5, 2021.
- ⁵²⁶ Elizabeth Fones-Wolf and Ken Fones-Wolf, “Lending a Hand to Labor: James Myers and the Federal Council of Churches,” 1926-1947, *Church History* Vol. 68, No. 1 (Mar., 1999), 82, accessed September 5, 2021.
- ⁵²⁷ Elizabeth Fones-Wolf and Ken Fones-Wolf, “Lending a Hand to Labor: James Myers and the Federal Council of Churches,” 1926-1947, *Church History* Vol. 68, No. 1 (Mar., 1999), 82, accessed September 5, 2021.
- ⁵²⁸ Elizabeth Fones-Wolf and Ken Fones-Wolf, “Lending a Hand to Labor: James Myers and the Federal Council of Churches,” 1926-1947, *Church History* Vol. 68, No. 1 (Mar., 1999), 82, accessed September 5, 2021.
- ⁵²⁹ “National Labor Relations Act,” National Relations Labor Board, accessed September 5, 2021, <https://www.nlr.gov/guidance/key-reference-materials/ley-de-relaciones-obrero-patronales>.
- ⁵³⁰ Zoë Robinson, “Lobbying in the Shadows: Religious Interests Groups in the Legislative Process,” *Emory Law Journal* Vol. 64 (2015): 1052.
- ⁵³¹ “Who We Are,” Friends Committee on National Legislation, accessed September 18, 2017, <https://www.fcnl.org/about/who>.
- ⁵³² Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 25.
- ⁵³³ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 40.
- ⁵³⁴ Mary Sawyer, “The Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, 1934-1964” *Church History* Vol. 59, No. 1 (Mar., 1990), 52, accessed September 6, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3169085>.
- ⁵³⁵ Mary Sawyer, “The Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, 1934-1964” *Church History* Vol. 59, No. 1 (Mar., 1990), 53, accessed September 6, 2021.
- ⁵³⁶ Mary Sawyer, “The Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, 1934-1964” *Church History* Vol. 59, No. 1 (Mar., 1990), 57, accessed September 6, 2021.
- ⁵³⁷ About – National Association of Evangelicals,” National Association of Evangelicals, accessed September 6, 2021, <https://www.nae.net/about-nae/>
- ⁵³⁸ “History – National Association of Evangelicals,” National Association of Evangelicals, accessed September 4, 2021, <https://www.nae.net/about-nae/history/>.
- ⁵³⁹ Jacob Lupfer, “The rise and fall and rise of the National Council of Churches (Commentary),” Religious News Service, September 26, 2014, accessed September 4, 2021, <https://religionnews.com/2014/09/26/rise-fall-rise-national-council-churches-commentary/>.
- ⁵⁴⁰ Jacob Lupfer, “The rise and fall and rise of the National Council of Churches (Commentary),” Religious News Service, September 26, 2014, accessed September 4, 2021, <https://religionnews.com/2014/09/26/rise-fall-rise-national-council-churches-commentary/>.
- ⁵⁴¹ Amy Black, “Evangelicals and Politics: Where We’ve Been And Where We’re Headed,” National Association of Evangelicals, Fall 2006, accessed September 4, 2021, <https://www.nae.net/evangelicals-and-politics/>.
- ⁵⁴² Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 27.
- ⁵⁴³ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 28.
- ⁵⁴⁴ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 31
- ⁵⁴⁵ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 33
- ⁵⁴⁶ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 33.
- ⁵⁴⁷ “History – National Association of Evangelicals,” National Association of Evangelicals, accessed September 4, 2021, <https://www.nae.net/about-nae/history/>.
- ⁵⁴⁸ Luke Eugene Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation’s Capital*, 40.
- ⁵⁴⁹ Zoë Robinson, “Lobbying in the Shadows: Religious Interests Groups in the Legislative Process,” *Emory Law Journal* Vol. 64 (2015): 1052.
- ⁵⁵⁰ Zoë Robinson, “Lobbying in the Shadows: Religious Interests Groups in the Legislative Process,” *Emory Law Journal* Vol. 64 (2015): 1052-1053.
- ⁵⁵¹ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 26.
- ⁵⁵² Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful*, 26.
- ⁵⁵³ James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970), 5.
- ⁵⁵⁴ James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, 5.

- ⁵⁵⁵ James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, 6
- ⁵⁵⁶ James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, 5.
- ⁵⁵⁷ James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, 7.
- ⁵⁵⁸ James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, 31.
- ⁵⁵⁹ James L. Adams, *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*, 3.
- ⁵⁶⁰ Allen D. Hertzke, *Lobbying for the faithful: Religious advocacy groups in Washington, D.C.*, 26.
- ⁵⁶¹ “About USCCB,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed September 19, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/about/>.
- ⁵⁶² “About USCCB,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed September 19, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/about/>.
- ⁵⁶³ “The National Catholic War Council: An Inventory of Records of the National Catholic War Council at the American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives,” The Catholic University of America, accessed September 25, 2017, <http://archives.lib.cua.edu/findingaid/NCWarCouncil.cfm#IDEYAEHMKV0XYKLMDBZG3WKJSNAHIQITEPJIZNFCEELJVGFBHQMS2AO>.
- ⁵⁶⁴ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991), 25.
- ⁵⁶⁵ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, 25.
- ⁵⁶⁶ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, 25.
- ⁵⁶⁷ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, 25.
- ⁵⁶⁸ Timothy A. Byrnes, *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*, 25.
- ⁵⁶⁹ James H. Ryan, “National Catholic Welfare Council,” *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* Vol. 12, No. 45 (Mar., 1923): 120, accessed September 25, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30093161>.
- ⁵⁷⁰ Douglas J. Slawson, *The Foundation and First Decade of the National Catholic Welfare Council* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press of America, 1992), 33.
- ⁵⁷¹ Administrative Committee of Bishops, *Handbook of the National Catholic War Council*, (Washington, D.C.: The Authority of the Administrative Council of Bishops, 1918), 23, accessed September 25, 2017, https://archive.org/stream/handbookofnation00nati/handbookofnation00nati_djvu.txt.
- ⁵⁷² Douglas J. Slawson, *The Foundation and First Decade of the National Catholic Welfare Council* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press of America, 1992), 62-63.
- ⁵⁷³ James H. Ryan, “National Catholic Welfare Council,” *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* Vol. 12, No. 45 (Mar., 1923): 122.

Chapter 3

- ⁵⁷⁴ Dan McKanan, *Prophetic Encounters: Religion and the American Radical Tradition* (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 2011), 1.
- ⁵⁷⁵ Valerie Raleigh Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists* (London: Sage Publications, 1994) 3.
- ⁵⁷⁶ David K. Dunaway and Willa K. Baum, eds., *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, (Nashville, TN: The American Association for State and Local History), 4.
- ⁵⁷⁷ Valerie Raleigh Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, 6.
- ⁵⁷⁸ Valerie Raleigh Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, 7.
- ⁵⁷⁹ Valerie Raleigh Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*, 4.
- ⁵⁸⁰ Steinar Kvale and Svend Brinkmann, *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (London: Sage Publications, 2009), 17.
- ⁵⁸¹ Steinar Kvale and Svend Brinkmann, *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*, 131.
- ⁵⁸² Steinar Kvale and Svend Brinkmann, *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*, 130.
- ⁵⁸³ Alan Bryman, *Social Research Methods 4th Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 579.
- ⁵⁸⁴ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger* (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), 10.
- ⁵⁸⁵ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁵⁸⁶ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁵⁸⁷ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 10.

- ⁵⁸⁸ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 41.
- ⁵⁸⁹ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 41.
- ⁵⁹⁰ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 42.
- ⁵⁹¹ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 43.
- ⁵⁹² Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁵⁹³ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 43-44.
- ⁵⁹⁴ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 56.
- ⁵⁹⁵ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 56.
- ⁵⁹⁶ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 59.
- ⁵⁹⁷ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 60.
- ⁵⁹⁸ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 60.
- ⁵⁹⁹ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶⁰⁰ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 75.
- ⁶⁰¹ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶⁰² David Beckmann and Art Simon, *Grace at the Table: Ending Hunger in God's World* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 205.
- ⁶⁰³ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶⁰⁴ "Conducting An Offering of Letters," Bread for the World, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/conducting-an-offering-of-letters-updated-january-2017.pdf>.
- ⁶⁰⁵ Paul Simon and Art Simon, *The Politics of World Hunger* (New York: Harper's Magazine Press, 1973), xx.
- ⁶⁰⁶ David Beckmann and Art Simon, *Grace at the Table: Ending Hunger in God's World*, 205.
- ⁶⁰⁷ Richard E. Averbeck, "Offerings and Sacrifices," in Baker's Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology Online, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.biblestudytools.com/dictionaries/bakers-evangelical-dictionary/offerings-and-sacrifices.html>.
- ⁶⁰⁸ Richard E. Averbeck, "Offerings and Sacrifices," in Baker's Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology Online, accessed November 9, 2018.
- ⁶⁰⁹ "The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger," Bread for the World, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/downloads/biblical-basis-for-advocacy.pdf>.
- ⁶¹⁰ "The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger," Bread for the World, accessed November 9, 2018.
- ⁶¹¹ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶¹² Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶¹³ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶¹⁴ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶¹⁵ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁶¹⁶ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 76.
- ⁶¹⁷ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 78.
- ⁶¹⁸ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 78.
- ⁶¹⁹ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 78-79.
- ⁶²⁰ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 79.
- ⁶²¹ Art Simon, *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*, 81.
- ⁶²² David Beckmann, *Exodus from Hunger: We Are Called to Change the Politics of Hunger* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010) 92.
- ⁶²³ For more on the WIC Program see "Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)," United States Department of Agriculture: Food and Nutrition Service, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic/women-infants-and-children-wic>.
- ⁶²⁴ David Beckmann and Art Simon, *Grace at the Table: Ending Hunger in God's World*, 202.
- ⁶²⁵ For more on the TANF Program see "About TANF," United States Department of Health and Human Services: Office of Family Assistance, last modified June 28, 2017, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ofa/programs/tanf/about>.
- ⁶²⁶ Art Simon, letter to Senator, April 27, 1983.
- ⁶²⁷ Jessica Shahin, "The Many Reasons USDA is Celebrating 50 Years of SNAP," U.S. Department of Agriculture, accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2014/11/20/many-reasons-usda-celebrating-50-years-snap>.
- ⁶²⁸ "How the U.S. Farm Bill Can Help End Hunger," Bread for the World Institute Background Paper, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/downloads/briefing-paper-farm-bill-2017.pdf>.

- ⁶²⁹ “How the U.S. Farm Bill Can Help End Hunger,” Bread for the World Institute Background Paper, accessed November 9, 2018.
- ⁶³⁰ “How the U.S. Farm Bill Can Help End Hunger,” Bread for the World Resource Library, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/library/how-us-farm-bill-can-help-end-hunger>.
- ⁶³¹ “Hunger Programs,” Bread for the World, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/hunger-programs>.
- ⁶³² David Beckmann and Art Simon, *Grace at the Table: Ending Hunger in God’s World*, 39.
- ⁶³³ David Beckmann, *Exodus from Hunger: We Are Called to Change the Politics of Hunger*, 94.
- ⁶³⁴ David Beckmann, *Exodus from Hunger We Are Called to Change the Politics of Hunger*, 95.
- ⁶³⁵ David Beckmann, *Exodus from Hunger: We Are Called to Change the Politics of Hunger* 97.
- ⁶³⁶ “History & Mission,” Bread for the World, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/history-mission>.
- ⁶³⁷ “Bread for the World, Inc. and Affiliate: Consolidated Financial Statements and Independent Auditors’ Report, December 31, 2016,” Bread for the World, accessed November 9, 2018, http://files.bread.org/accountability/2016_financial_statement_Bread.pdf?_ga=2.60909988.988626559.1517825410-1274691220.1492604105.
- ⁶³⁸ “The Equal Rights Amendment,” *Women’s Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 3/4, THE 1970s (FALL/WINTER 2015): 271, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43958572>.
- ⁶³⁹ “The Equal Rights Amendment,” *Women’s Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 3/4, THE 1970s (FALL/WINTER 2015): 271.
- ⁶⁴⁰ Susan E. Marshall, “Who Speaks for Women? The Future of Anti-Feminism,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 515, American Feminism: New Issues for a Mature Movement (May, 1991): 51, accessed December 2, 2017, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1046927>.
- ⁶⁴¹ Susan E. Marshall, “Who Speaks for Women? The Future of Anti-Feminism,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 515, American Feminism: New Issues for a Mature Movement (May, 1991): 51
- ⁶⁴² Glenn H. Utter and John W. Storey, *The Religious Right*, (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 1995), 7.
- ⁶⁴³ Glenn H. Utter and John W. Storey, *The Religious Right*, 7.
- ⁶⁴⁴ “Our History,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed December 2, 2017, <https://concernedwomen.org/about/our-history/>.
- ⁶⁴⁵ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984), 27.
- ⁶⁴⁶ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 28-29.
- ⁶⁴⁷ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 29.
- ⁶⁴⁸ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 29.
- ⁶⁴⁹ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 29.
- ⁶⁵⁰ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 29-30.
- ⁶⁵¹ “Our History,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed December 2, 2017.
- ⁶⁵² Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 30.
- ⁶⁵³ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 29.
- ⁶⁵⁴ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 55.
- ⁶⁵⁵ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 55-56.
- ⁶⁵⁶ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 56-57.
- ⁶⁵⁷ Susan E. Marshall, “Who Speaks for Women? The Future of Anti-Feminism,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 515, American Feminism: New Issues for a Mature Movement (May, 1991): 52.
- ⁶⁵⁸ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 137.
- ⁶⁵⁹ “Our History,” Concerned Women for America, accessed December 2, 2017.
- ⁶⁶⁰ “Our History,” Concerned Women for America, accessed December 2, 2017.
- ⁶⁶¹ “Our History,” Concerned Women for America, accessed December 2, 2017.
- ⁶⁶² Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.

-
- ⁶⁶³ “A War No More: The Truth Behind the War on Women,” A Publication of Concerned Women for America and the Beverly LaHaye Institute, 4, accessed November 9, 2018, <http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/War-on-Women.pdf>.
- ⁶⁶⁴ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁶⁵ “Our Mission,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁶⁶ “Our Mission,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁶⁷ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁶⁸ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁶⁹ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁷⁰ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁷¹ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁷² “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁷³ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁷⁴ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁷⁵ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁷⁶ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁷⁷ “Freedom of Conscience Fact Card,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed January 2, 2018, <http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/freedomofconscience-factcard.pdf>.
- ⁶⁷⁸ For more information about this Supreme Court case see “Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.,” Cornell Law School: Legal Information Institute, accessed November 11, 2018, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/13-354>.
- ⁶⁷⁹ “BURWELL, SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL. v. HOBBY LOBBY STORES, INC., ET AL.” The Supreme Court of the United States of America, accessed November 11, 2018, https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/13pdf/13-354_olp1.pdf.
- ⁶⁸⁰ The RFRA is an acronym for the Religious Freedom and Restoration Act, which is a bill passed by the U.S. Congress on November 16, 1983, that undergirds the Religious Liberty Clause in the Constitution particularly in cases where laws that are apparently neutral and without religious inference result in impacting one’s religious practices. Partial language of the law states: “Government shall not substantially burden a person’s exercise of religion even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section,” quoted from “42 U.S. Code § 2000bb–1 - Free exercise of religion protected,” Cornell Law School: Legal Information Institute, accessed January 15, 2018, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/2000bb-1>.
- ⁶⁸¹ Adam Liptak, “Supreme Court Rejects Contraception Mandate for Some Corporations,” *New York Times*, June 30, 2014, accessed July 15, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/01/us/hobby-lobby-case-supreme-court-contraception.html>.
- ⁶⁸² “Education,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed July 15, 2018, <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/education/>.
- ⁶⁸³ “Education,” Concerned Women for America, accessed July 15, 2018.
- ⁶⁸⁴ For more information on the Common Core State Standards see “Background on Common Core State Standards,” National Education Association, accessed November 11, 2018, <http://www.nea.org/home/56612.htm>.
- ⁶⁸⁵ “Stop Common Core “State” Standards: An Unconstitutional Experiment on Our Children,” Concerned Women for America, accessed November 5, 2017, http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/CWA_StopCommonCore.pdf.
- ⁶⁸⁶ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁸⁷ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁸⁸ “National Sovereignty,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed November 11, 2018. <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/national-sovereignty/>.
- ⁶⁸⁹ “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed January 2, 2018.
- ⁶⁹⁰ “Support for Israel,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed January 2, 2018, <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/support-for-israel/>.
- ⁶⁹¹ “U.S. Foreign Aid by Country,” USAID, accessed January 2, 2018, https://explorer.usaid.gov/cd/ISR?fiscal_year=2016&measure=Obligations.

-
- ⁶⁹² Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁹³ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁹⁴ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁹⁵ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁹⁶ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁹⁷ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁹⁸ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁶⁹⁹ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁷⁰⁰ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁷⁰¹ “Young Women for America,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed January 2, 2018, <https://concernedwomen.org/special-projects/ywa/>.
- ⁷⁰² Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁷⁰³ Kenda Bartlett and Hannah Wegman, interview by author, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2016.
- ⁷⁰⁴ “Concerned Women for America,” Charity Navigator: Your Guide to Intelligent Giving, accessed January 12, 2018, <https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3557>.
- ⁷⁰⁵ Stephen Colecchi, interview with author, Washington, D.C., February 19, 2016.
- ⁷⁰⁶ Stephen Colecchi, interview with author, Washington, D.C., February 19, 2016.
- ⁷⁰⁷ “United States Conference of Catholic Bishops Office of the General Secretary: An Inventory of the Records of the Office of the General Secretary at The American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives,” The Catholic University of America, accessed November 11, 2018, <http://archives.lib.cua.edu/findingaid/ncwcogs.cfm>.
- ⁷⁰⁸ “United States Conference of Catholic Bishops Office of the General Secretary: An Inventory of the Records of the Office of the General Secretary at The American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives,” The Catholic University of America, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁰⁹ Stephen Colecchi, interview with author, Washington, D.C., February 19, 2016.
- ⁷¹⁰ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.
- ⁷¹¹ Stephen Colecchi, interview with author, Washington, D.C., February 19, 2016.
- ⁷¹² “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/about/government-relations/>.
- ⁷¹³ “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.
- ⁷¹⁴ “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.
- ⁷¹⁵ “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.
- ⁷¹⁶ “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.
- ⁷¹⁷ “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.
- ⁷¹⁸ “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.
- ⁷¹⁹ “Refugee Resettlement,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/migrants-refugees-and-travelers/refugee-resettlement/index.cfm>.
- ⁷²⁰ “UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS AND AFFILIATES: Consolidated Financial Statements with Supplemental Schedules December 31, 2016 and 2015,”

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 23, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/about/financial-reporting/upload/financial-statements-2015-2016.pdf>.

⁷²¹ “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.

⁷²² “Government Relations,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 27, 2017.

⁷²³ “UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS AND AFFILIATES: Consolidated Financial Statements with Supplemental Schedules December 31, 2016 and 2015,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 23, 2017.

⁷²⁴ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷²⁵ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷²⁶ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷²⁷ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷²⁸ Ambassador Robert T. Hennemeyer, interview with author, Maryland, March 3, 2016.

⁷²⁹ Ambassador Robert T. Hennemeyer, interview with author, Maryland, March 3, 2016.

⁷³⁰ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷³¹ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷³² Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷³³ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷³⁴ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷³⁵ Robert T. Hennemeyer, “Working for the Holy Mother Church,” unpublished document emailed to author, February 22, 2016.

⁷³⁶ “Murder of Jesuit Priests and Civilians in El Salvador: The Jesuits Massacre Case,” Center for Justice and Accountability, accessed November 11, 2018, <http://cja.org/what-we-do/litigation/the-jesuits-massacre-case/>.

⁷³⁷ See Raymond Bonner, “Time for a US Apology to El Salvador: Obama recently expressed regret for US support of Argentina’s “dirty war.” It’s time Washington did the same regarding our active backing of right-wing butchery in El Salvador,” *The Nation*, April 15, 2016, accessed December 5, 2017, <https://www.thenation.com/article/time-for-a-us-apology-to-el-salvador/>.

⁷³⁸ Lindsey Gruson, “MAN IN THE NEWS; The New Face of the Right: Alfredo Cristiani,” *New York Times*, March 21, 1989, accessed December 5, 2017, <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/03/21/world/man-in-the-news-the-new-face-of-the-right-alfredo-cristiani.html>.

⁷³⁹ Raymond Bonner, “Time for a US Apology to El Salvador: Obama recently expressed regret for US support of Argentina’s “dirty war.” It’s time Washington did the same regarding our active backing of right-wing butchery in El Salvador,” *The Nation*, April 15, 2016, accessed December 5, 2017.

⁷⁴⁰ Ambassador Robert T. Hennemeyer, interview with author, Maryland, March 3, 2016.

⁷⁴¹ Ambassador Robert T. Hennemeyer, interview with author, Maryland, March 3, 2016.

⁷⁴² Ambassador Robert T. Hennemeyer, interview with author, Maryland, March 3, 2016.

⁷⁴³ For a comprehensive historical work on the “Troubles” in Northern Ireland see David McKittrick and David McVea, *Making Sense of the Troubles: A History of the Northern Ireland Conflict* (London: Penguin Books, 2000).

⁷⁴⁴ “The Troubles: Thirty years of conflict in Northern Ireland, 1968-1998,” BBC History, accessed December 11, 2017, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/troubles>.

⁷⁴⁵ “The Troubles: Thirty years of conflict in Northern Ireland, 1968-1998,” BBC History, accessed December 11, 2017.

⁷⁴⁶ “The Troubles: Thirty years of conflict in Northern Ireland, 1968-1998,” BBC History, accessed December 11, 2017.

⁷⁴⁷ “The Troubles: Thirty years of conflict in Northern Ireland, 1968-1998,” BBC History, accessed December 11, 2017.

- ⁷⁴⁸ “Ecumenical Initiatives on Northern Ireland,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed December 11, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/global-issues/europe/northern-ireland/ecumenical-initiatives-on-northern-ireland-1998-1999.cfm>.
- ⁷⁴⁹ Robert McGinty, “American Influences on the Northern Ireland Peace Process,” *The Journal of Conflict Studies*, Vol. XVII No. 2, Fall 1997: accessed November 11, 2018, <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/jcs/article/view/11750/12521>.
- ⁷⁵⁰ “Ecumenical Initiatives on Northern Ireland,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed December 11, 2017.
- ⁷⁵¹ “Ecumenical Initiatives on Northern Ireland,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed December 11, 2017.
- ⁷⁵² Gerard Powers, interview with author, Indiana, March 22, 2016.
- ⁷⁵³ Gerard Powers, interview with author, Indiana, March 22, 2016.
- ⁷⁵⁴ “A Jubilee Call for Debt Forgiveness: A Statement by the Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed December 11, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/debt-relief/jubilee-debt-forgiveness.cfm>.
- ⁷⁵⁵ “The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger,” Bread for the World, accessed November 11, 2018, <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/downloads/biblical-basis-for-advocacy.pdf>.
- ⁷⁵⁶ David Beckmann, *Exodus from Hunger: We Are Called to Change the Politics of Hunger*, 68.
- ⁷⁵⁷ David Beckmann, *Exodus from Hunger: We Are Called to Change the Politics of Hunger*, 68.
- ⁷⁵⁸ “The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger,” Bread for the World, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁵⁹ “The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger,” Bread for the World, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁶⁰ “The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger,” Bread for the World, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁶¹ “The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger,” Bread for the World, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁶² David Beckmann and Art Simon, *Grace at the Table: Ending Hunger in God’s World*, 156.
- ⁷⁶³ “Political Guidelines for Churches and Pastors: General Guidelines for Churches in Determining How to Affect Government and Public Policy without Jeopardizing their Non-profit Status,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed November 11, 2018, <https://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/D-Political-Guidelines-for-Churches-and-Pastors.pdf>.
- ⁷⁶⁴ “Political Guidelines for Churches and Pastors: General Guidelines for Churches in Determining How to Affect Government and Public Policy without Jeopardizing their Non-profit Status,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁶⁵ See “Our Issues,” Concerned Women for America, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁶⁶ For a wide-ranging work on the concept of American exceptionalism and the theological constructs that undergird it see Conrad Cherry, ed., *God’s New Israel: Religious Interpretations of American Destiny* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).
- ⁷⁶⁷ See H.A. Washington, ed., *The Writing of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. 6* (Frankfurt am Main: Outlook Verlag, GmbH, 2018), 117.
- ⁷⁶⁸ H.A. Washington, ed., *The Writing of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. 6*, 117.
- ⁷⁶⁹ H.A. Washington, ed., *The Writing of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. 6*, 115-116.
- ⁷⁷⁰ H.A. Washington, ed., *The Writing of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. 6*, 117.
- ⁷⁷¹ Helen Deutsch, *A Profile of American Women in the Twentieth Century* (Washington, D.C.: The Beverly LaHaye Institute, 2001), 10, accessed November 13, 2018, <http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/gg1-72.pdf>.
- ⁷⁷² “Our Mission,” Concerned Women for America, accessed November 13, 2018.
- ⁷⁷³ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 13.
- ⁷⁷⁴ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 13.
- ⁷⁷⁵ “Defense of the Family,” Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee, accessed November 13, 2018, <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/defense-of-family/>.
- ⁷⁷⁶ “Defense of the Family,” Concerned Women for America, accessed November 13, 2018.
- ⁷⁷⁷ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 135-136.

- ⁷⁷⁸ Beverly LaHaye, *Who But A Woman?*, 136.
- ⁷⁷⁹ Stephen M. Colecchi, *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching* (Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2001), 50.
- ⁷⁸⁰ “Catholic Social Teaching,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 18, 2018, <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/index.cfm>.
- ⁷⁸¹ Stephen M. Colecchi, *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching*, 50; additionally, see Charles E. Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching 1891-Present: A Historical, Theological, And Ethical Analysis* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2002); and David A. Boileau, ed., *Principles of Catholic Social Teaching* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994).
- ⁷⁸² Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of its Traditional Defense*, 22-23.
- ⁷⁸³ Stephen M. Colecchi, *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching*, 50.
- ⁷⁸⁴ Fred Kramer, S.J., “Catholic Social Teaching and Distributive Justice,” *JustSouth Quarterly* Spring 2010: 3, accessed November 11, 2018. http://loyno.edu/jsri/sites/loyno.edu.jsri/files/CST_Distributive_Justice.pdf.
- ⁷⁸⁵ Fred Kramer, S.J., “Catholic Social Teaching and Distributive Justice,” *JustSouth Quarterly* Spring 2010: 3, accessed November 11, 2018.
- ⁷⁸⁶ B. Ketter, *Principles of Catholic Social Teaching*, ed., David A. Boileau (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994) 93.
- ⁷⁸⁷ “Two Feet of Love in Action,” United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, accessed November 13, 2018, <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/two-feet-of-love-in-action.cfm>.
- ⁷⁸⁸ Stephen M. Colecchi, *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching*, 53-54.
- ⁷⁸⁹ Stephen M. Colecchi, *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching*, 56.
- ⁷⁹⁰ Stephen M. Colecchi, *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching*, 56.
- ⁷⁹¹ Stephen M. Colecchi, *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching*, 55.

Chapter 4

- ⁷⁹² Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses*, trans. G. D. H. Cole (Vermont: Everyman, 1913), 302.
- ⁷⁹³ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses*, 302-303.
- ⁷⁹⁴ For extra-biblical material on Herod the Great see Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book XV.
- ⁷⁹⁵ Obery M. Hendricks, Jr., *The Politics of Jesus: Rediscovering the True Revolutionary Nature of Jesus’ Teaching and How They Have Been Corrupted* (New York: Three Leaves Press, 2006) 41.
- ⁷⁹⁶ Obery M. Hendricks, Jr., *The Politics of Jesus: Rediscovering the True Revolutionary Nature of Jesus’ Teaching and How They Have Been Corrupted*, 41.
- ⁷⁹⁷ Obery M. Hendricks, Jr., *The Politics of Jesus: Rediscovering the True Revolutionary Nature of Jesus’ Teaching and How They Have Been Corrupted*, 41.
- ⁷⁹⁸ Micah 5:2 (New Revised Standard Version).
- ⁷⁹⁹ See Matthew 2:16-18.
- ⁸⁰⁰ Leo Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God Is Within You: Christianity Not As A Mystic Religion But As A New Theory of Life*, trans. Constance Garnett (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 340.
- ⁸⁰¹ F.F. Bruce, *The Defense of the Gospel in the New Testament* (Leicester, England: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959), 5.
- ⁸⁰² F.F. Bruce, *The Defense of the Gospel in the New Testament*, 5.
- ⁸⁰³ On the Kant’s “kingdom of ends” see Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, ed. Mary Gregor and Jens Timmerman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

⁸⁰⁴ Richard Niebuhr contends the theoretical positions formulated by Kant on this theme suggest, “All the references are to man and to man’s work; [and] the word ‘God’ seems to be an intrusion,” in H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1951), 99.

⁸⁰⁵ See Luke 4:18

⁸⁰⁶ F.F. Bruce, *The Defense of the Gospel in the New Testament*, 7.

⁸⁰⁷ See Matthew 27:37; Mark 15:26; Luke 23:38; and John 19:19.

⁸⁰⁸ Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark’s Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1988), 386.

⁸⁰⁹ Political Theology as a field of discipline within theology seeks to understand the relationship between sacred texts like the Bible—as well as religious traditions in general—and their impact and relationship to given political orders or practices. In his introductory statement on this theme, Andrew Arato argues, “Some of our significant political concepts are secularized theological ones,” in Andrew Arato, “Political Theology and Populism,” *Social Research*, Vol. 80, No. 1, Political Theology? (SPRING 2013): 143, accessed November 17, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24385712>. This understanding of political theology is in alignment with scholars like Carl Schmitt who argued a similar position in relation to theological concepts secular usage in the realm of politics. See Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. George Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934). Furthermore, Christian theologians since Early Church history have sought to understand the relationship between the Church and the political order of their day. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, translated by Fathers of English Dominican Province (Allen, TX: Christian Classics, 1911); for a more contemporary leading voice in Political theology see Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, trans. James W. Leitch (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

⁸¹⁰ Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 11.

⁸¹¹ Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 472.

⁸¹² Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 472.

⁸¹³ Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 472.

⁸¹⁴ Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 11.

⁸¹⁵ Scott R. Paeth, “Jürgen Moltmann’s Public Theology,” *Political Theology Journal* Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2005: 217, accessed July 1, 2019, https://www.academia.edu/4672278/J%C3%9CRGEN_MOLTMANNNS_PUBLIC_THEOLOGY.

⁸¹⁶ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015), 476.

⁸¹⁷ Scott R. Paeth, “Jürgen Moltmann’s Public Theology,” *Political Theology Journal* Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2005: 216, accessed July 1, 2019,

⁸¹⁸ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 2.

⁸¹⁹ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 28.

⁸²⁰ Scott R. Paeth, “Jürgen Moltmann’s Public Theology,” *Political Theology Journal* Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2005: 217, accessed July 1, 2019.

⁸²¹ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 479.

⁸²² Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 479.

⁸²³ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 478.

⁸²⁴ Scott R. Paeth, “Jürgen Moltmann’s Public Theology,” *Political Theology Journal* Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2005: 217, accessed July 1, 2019.

⁸²⁵ Scott R. Paeth, “Jürgen Moltmann’s Public Theology,” *Political Theology Journal* Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2005: 216, accessed July 1, 2019.

⁸²⁶ Scott R. Paeth, “Jürgen Moltmann’s Public Theology,” *Political Theology Journal* Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2005: 216, accessed July 1, 2019.

⁸²⁷ Stanley Hauerwas and William H. Willimon, *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2014), 28.

⁸²⁸ Karl Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline* (New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1959), 47.

⁸²⁹ Werner G. Jeanrond, “From Resistance to Liberation Theology: German Theologians and the Non/ Resistance to the National Socialist Regime,” *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 64, Supplement: Resistance Against the Third Reich (Dec., 1992): S188, accessed July 1, 2019, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2124977>.

⁸³⁰ Werner G. Jeanrond, “From Resistance to Liberation Theology: German Theologians and the Non/ Resistance to the National Socialist Regime,” *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 64, Supplement: Resistance Against the Third Reich (Dec., 1992): S189.

⁸³¹ Donald D. Wall, “The Confessing Church and the Second World War,” *Journal of Church and State*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Winter 1981): 15, accessed November 13, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23915897>.

28. ⁸³² Stanley Hauerwas and William H. Willimon, *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony*, 28.
- ⁸³³ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 47.
- ⁸³⁴ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 48.
- ⁸³⁵ See the Augustine, *City of God* and Martin Luther, *Von Weltlicher Oberkeit*.
- ⁸³⁶ Kenneth L. Deutsch and Joseph R. Fornieri, *An Invitation to Political Thought* (Belmont, CA: Thomas Wadsworth, 2009), 169.
- ⁸³⁷ David Vandrunen, "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine and the Relationship of Church and State in Early Reformed Tradition," *Journal of Church and State*, Vol. 49, No. 4 (Autumn 2007): 743-744, accessed April 13, 2019, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23922304>.
- ⁸³⁸ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 48.
- ⁸³⁹ Alison Graff, "January Series 2009: Church and State in Calvinist Geneva," Calvin College, January 8, 2009, accessed November 13, 2018, <https://calvin.edu/news/archive/january-series-2009-church-and-state-in-calvinist-geneva>.
- ⁸⁴⁰ John T. McNeill, "The Democratic Element in Calvin's Thought," *Church History*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Sep., 1949): 155, accessed January 4, 2019, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3162238>.
- ⁸⁴¹ Harold J. Grimm, "Luther's Conception of Territorial and National Loyalty," *Church History*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Jun., 1948): 84-85.
- ⁸⁴² Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 49.
- ⁸⁴³ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 50.
- ⁸⁴⁴ John T. McNeill, "The Democratic Element in Calvin's Thought," *Church History*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Sep., 1949): 156.
- ⁸⁴⁵ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 56.
- ⁸⁴⁶ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 56.
- ⁸⁴⁷ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 74.
- ⁸⁴⁸ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 75.
- ⁸⁴⁹ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 79.
- ⁸⁵⁰ Harro Höpfl, ed., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*, 83.
- ⁸⁵¹ John T. McNeill, "The Democratic Element in Calvin's Thought," *Church History*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Sep., 1949): 161.
- ⁸⁵² William J. Bouwsma, "Explaining John Calvin," *The Wilson Quarterly* (1976-), Vol. 13, No. 1 (New Year's 1989): 75, accessed July 4, 2019, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40257444>.
- ⁸⁵³ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses*, 302-303.
- ⁸⁵⁴ "About," Concerned Women for America, accessed September 13, 2021.
- ⁸⁵⁵ Doug Rossinow, "The Radicalization of the Social Gospel: Harry F. Ward and the Search for a New Social Order, 1898-1936," *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter 2005): 63, accessed March 23, 2018, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/rac.2005.15.1.63>.
- ⁸⁵⁶ Although the Social Gospel is usually immediately associated with Rauschenbusch, another prominent voice during this movement was Washington Gladden. See Washington Gladden, *The Christian Way: Whither It Leads And How To God On* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company Publishers, 1877).
- ⁸⁵⁷ Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1926), 48.
- ⁸⁵⁸ Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1917), 167.
- ⁸⁵⁹ D. M. Yeager, "Focus on the Social Gospel: An Introduction," *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Spring, 1990): 3, accessed July 4, 2019, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40017825>
- ⁸⁶⁰ William McGuire King, "'History as Revelation' in the Theology of the Social Gospel," *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 76, No. 1 (Jan., 1983): 113, accessed July 4, 2019, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1509439>.
- ⁸⁶¹ Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 165
- ⁸⁶² Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 148.
- ⁸⁶³ Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 137.
- ⁸⁶⁴ Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order*, 48.
- ⁸⁶⁵ Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 142-143.
- ⁸⁶⁶ Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 142.
- ⁸⁶⁷ Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order*, 49.
- ⁸⁶⁸ Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, 141.

-
- ⁸⁶⁹ See Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- ⁸⁷⁰ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man: Human Nature Volume 1* (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1941), 178.
- ⁸⁷¹ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 178.
- ⁸⁷² Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 178.
- ⁸⁷³ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 178.
- ⁸⁷⁴ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 178.
- ⁸⁷⁵ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 179.
- ⁸⁷⁶ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 179.
- ⁸⁷⁷ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, xi-xii.
- ⁸⁷⁸ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, xii.
- ⁸⁷⁹ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, vix-xv.
- ⁸⁸⁰ Brent W. Sockness, "Luther's Two Kingdoms Revisited: A Response to Reinhold Niebuhr's Criticism of Luther," *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Spring, 1992): 93.
- ⁸⁸¹ See Luther's *Von Weltlicher Oberkeit*.
- ⁸⁸² Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and A Critique of its Traditional Defense*, 118.
- ⁸⁸³ Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. "Reinhold Niebuhr's Long Shadow," *New York Times*, June 22, 1992, accessed November 14, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/1992/06/22/opinion/reinhold-niebuhr-s-long-shadow.html>
- ⁸⁸⁴ Art Simon, interview by author, Maryland, February 24, 2016.
- ⁸⁸⁵ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and A Critique of its Traditional Defense*, 82.

Bibliography

- Ackerman, Bruce. *The Failure of the Founding Fathers: Jefferson, Marshall, and the Rise of Presidential Democracy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Adams, James L. *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington*. Grand Rapids Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970.
- Administrative Committee of Bishops. *Handbook of the National Catholic War Council*. Washington, D.C.: The Authority of the Administrative Council of Bishops, 1918. Accessed September 25, 2017, https://archive.org/stream/handbookofnation00nati/handbookofnation00nati_djvu.txt.
- Allitt, Patrick. *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950-1985*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Anderson, Charles W. *A Deeper Freedom: Liberal Democracy as an Everyday Morality*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2002.
- Anselm of Canterbury. *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatise of Anselm of Canterbury*. Translated by Jasper Hopkin and Herbert Richardson. Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of English Dominican Province. Allen, TX: Christian Classics, 1911.
- Arato, Andrew. "Political Theology and Populism." *Social Research*, Vol. 80, No. 1, Political Theology? (SPRING 2013): 143-172. Accessed November 17, 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24385712>.
- Aristotle. *The Nichomachean Ethics*. Translated by David Ross. Revised by J.L. Ackrill and J. O. Urson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925.
- Ashcraft, Richard. *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.
- St. Augustine. *City of God*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin Books, 1467.
- _____. *On Christian Doctrine*. Translated by J.F. Shaw. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2009.
- _____. *On True Religion*. Translated by J. H. S. Burleigh. South Bend, Indiana: Regenery/Gateway, Inc., 1953.
- Aulén, Gustaf. *The Faith of the Christian Church*. Translated by Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948.

- Austen-Smith, David and John R. Wright, "Competitive lobbying for a legislator's vote." *Social Choice and Welfare*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (1992): 229-257. Accessed July 31, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41106026>.
- Averbeck, Richard E. "Offerings and Sacrifices." In Baker's Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology Online. Accessed November 9, 2018. <https://www.biblestudytools.com/dictionaries/bakers-evangelical-dictionary/offerings-and-sacrifices.html>.
- Barth, Karl. *Dogmatics in Outline*. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1959.
- BBC History. "The Troubles: Thirty years of conflict in Northern Ireland, 1968-1998." Accessed December 11, 2017. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/troubles>.
- Beard, Rick. "When Douglass Met Lincoln." *New York Times*, August 9, 2013. Accessed July 3, 2017. <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/08/09/when-douglass-met-lincoln/>.
- Beckmann, David. *Exodus from Hunger: We Are Called to Change the Politics of Hunger*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.
- Beckmann, David and Art Simon. *Grace at the Table: Ending Hunger in God's World*. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.
- Bennedsen, Morten and Sven E. Feldmann. "Lobbying Legislators." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 110, No. 4 (August 2002): pp. 919-946. Accessed October 12, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/340775>.
- Benson, Bruce Ellis and Peter Goodwin Heltzel, eds. *Evangelicals and Empire: Christian Alternatives to the Political Status Quo*. Grand Rapid, Michigan: Brazos Press, 2008.
- Berman, Harold J. "The Spiritualization of Secular Law: The Impact of the Lutheran Reformation," *Journal of Law and Religion*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (1999 - 2000): 313-348. Accessed July 2, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3556574>.
- Berry, Jeffrey M. *The Interest Group Society: Third Edition*. New York: Longman, Inc., 1997.
- Bertrand, Marianne, Matilde Bombardini, and Francesco Trebbi. *Is It Whom You Know or What You Know? An Empirical Assessment of the Lobbying Process - Working Paper 16765*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2011.
- Bertram, Christopher. "John Jacques Rousseau." Edited by Edward N. Zalta. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 Edition). Accessed November 8, 2018, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rousseau/#IdeaGeneWill>.

- Billings, Warren M. ed. *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606-1700*. Chapel Hill: University Press of North Carolina, 2007.
- Black, Amy. "Evangelicals and Politics: Where We've Been And Where We're Headed." National Association of Evangelicals, Fall 2006. Accessed September 4, 2021. <https://www.nae.net/evangelicals-and-politics/>.
- BlackPast. "Freedom's Journal (1827-1829)." Accessed June 30, 2017. <http://www.blackpast.org/aah/freedom-s-journal-1827-1829#sthash.DSdDEVVF.dpuf>.
- Blassingame, John W. ed. *The Frederick Douglass Papers: Series One: Speeches, Debates and Interviews, Volume 2, 1847-54*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Boileau, David A., ed. *Principles of Catholic Social Teaching*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994.
- Bole, William, Drew Christiansen, S.J., and Robert Hennemeyer. *Forgiveness in International Politics... An Alternative Road to Peace*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004.
- Boller, Jr., Paul F. "George Washington and the Quakers." *Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Autumn 1960): 67-83. Accessed October 20, 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41944729>.
- Bonner, Raymond. "Time for a US Apology to El Salvador: Obama recently expressed regret for US support of Argentina's "dirty war." It's time Washington did the same regarding our active backing of right-wing butchery in El Salvador." *The Nation*, April 15, 2016. Accessed December 5, 2017. <https://www.thenation.com/article/time-for-a-us-apology-to-el-salvador/>.
- Bonus, Holger. "On Social Justice." *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft / Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, Bd. 138, H. 3., Social Policy in a Free Market Economy: A Symposium (September 1982): 599-617. Accessed October 18, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40750554>.
- Boston College: Boise Center for Religion and American Public Life. "An Introduction to Christian Theology vol. 1 of the Boise Center Papers on Religion in the United States, 2007." Accessed November 14, 2018. https://www.bc.edu/centers/boisi/publications/boisi_center_papers.html.
- Boston, Robert. *The Most Dangerous Man in America? Pat Robertson and the Rise of the Christian Coalition*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1996.
- Bouwsma, William J. "Explaining John Calvin," *The Wilson Quarterly* (1976-), Vol. 13, No. 1 (New Year's 1989): 68-75. Accessed July 4, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40257444>.

- Bread for the World. "About Us: History and Mission." Accessed October 9, 2017. <http://www.bread.org/history-mission>.
- _____. "Bible and Mass Incarceration." Accessed October 1, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/downloads/gar-how-to-bible-mass-incar.pdf>.
- _____. "Conducting An Offering of Letters." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/conducting-an-offering-of-letters-updated-january-2017.pdf>.
- _____. "Policy Change." Accessed October 1, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/policy-change>.
- _____. "The Biblical Basis for Advocacy to End Hunger." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/downloads/biblical-basis-for-advocacy.pdf>.
- _____. "Bread for the World, Inc. and Affiliate: Consolidated Financial Statements and Independent Auditors' Report, December 31, 2016," Accessed November 9, 2018. http://files.bread.org/accountability/2016_financial_statement_Bread.pdf?_ga=2.60909988.988626559.1517825410-1274691220.1492604105.
- _____. "History & Mission." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/history-mission>.
- _____. "How the U.S. Farm Bill Can Help End Hunger." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/library/how-us-farm-bill-can-help-end-hunger>.
- _____. "Hunger Programs." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/hunger-programs>.
- Bread for the World Institute. "Background Paper: How the U.S. Farm Bill Can Help End Hunger." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://www.bread.org/sites/default/files/downloads/briefing-paper-farm-bill-2017.pdf>.
- Bridgers, Lynn. *The American Religious Experience: A Concise History*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006.
- British Library. "Timeline of the American Civil War." Accessed July 7, 2017. <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/uscivilwar/timeline/timelinecivilwar.html>.
- Brown University. "Stephen Hopkins." Accessed October 16, 2018. https://www.brown.edu/Administration/News_Bureau/Databases/Encyclopedia/search.php?serial=H0240.

- Bruce, F.F. *The Defense of the Gospel in the New Testament*. Leicester, England: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods 4th Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Busha, Charles and Stephen P. Harter. *Research Methods in Librarianship: Techniques and Interpretations*. Academic Press: New York, NY, 1980. Accessed October 10, 2018. <https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/~palmquis/courses/historical.htm>.
- Byrnes, Timothy A. *Catholic Bishops in American Politics*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Caesar, Rebecca. "University of Rochester Frederick Douglass Project: Frederick Douglass Relationship with Abraham Lincoln." University of Rochester River Campus Libraries. Accessed July 3, 2017. <http://rbscp.lib.rochester.edu/4071>.
- Caldeira, Gregory A. Marie Hojnacki, and John R. Wright. "The Lobbying Activities of Organized Interests in Federal Judicial Nominations." *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (Feb. 2000): 51-69. Accessed December 17, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2647597.pdf>.
- Carey, Brycchan and Geoffrey Plank, eds. *Quakers & Abolition*. Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014.
- Carey, Patrick W. *The Roman Catholics*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1993.
- Caruso, Marcelo ed. *Classroom Struggle: Organizing Elementary School Teaching in the 19th Century*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 2015.
- Catt, Helena. *Democracy in Practice*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Center for Justice and Accountability. "Murder of Jesuit Priests and Civilians in El Salvador: The Jesuits Massacre Case." Accessed November 11, 2018. <http://cja.org/what-we-do/litigation/the-jesuits-massacre-case/>.
- Center of Leadership Equity and Research. "Social Justice." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://clearvoz.com/social-justice/>.
- Center for Responsive Politics. "Lobbying Database." Last modified October 28, 2016. Accessed December 6, 2016. <https://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/>.
- Charity Navigator. "Concerned Women for America." Accessed January 12, 2018. <https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3557>.

- Cherry, Conrad ed. *God's New Israel*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Chewning, Richard C. ed. *Biblical Principles & Public Policy: The Practice*. Colorado Springs, Colorado: NavPress, 1991.
- Christiansen, S.J., Drew and Walter Grazer eds. "*And God Saw It Was Good*": *Catholic Theology And The Environment*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1986.
- Church & Society: The United Methodist Church. "Social Principles and Resolutions." Accessed October 9, 2017. <https://www.umcjustice.org/who-we-are/social-principles-and-resolutions>.
- _____. "The United Methodist Church." Accessed October 9, 2017. <https://www.umcjustice.org/who-we-are/the-united-methodist-church>.
- Coleman, S.J., John A. ed. *Christian Political Ethics*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Colecchi, Stephen M. *In the Footsteps of Jesus: Resource Manual on Catholic Social Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2001.
- Concerned Women for America: Legislative Action Committee. "About Us." Accessed October 9, 2017. <https://concernedwomen.org/about/>.
- _____. "A War No More: The Truth Behind the War on Women." Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/War-on-Women.pdf>.
- _____. "Defense of the Family," Accessed November 13, 2018. <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/defense-of-family/>.
- _____. "Education." Accessed July 15, 2018. <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/education/>.
- _____. "Freedom of Conscience Fact Card." Accessed January 2, 2018. <http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/freedomofconscience-factcard.pdf>.
- _____. "National Sovereignty." Accessed November 11, 2018. <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/national-sovereignty/>.
- _____. "Our History." Accessed December 2, 2017. <https://concernedwomen.org/about/our-history/>.
- _____. "Our Issues." Accessed October 30, 2017. <https://concernedwomen.org/issues/>.

- _____. "Our Mission." Accessed November 5, 2017.
<https://concernedwomen.org/about/vision-mission/>.
- _____. "Political Guidelines for Churches and Pastors: General Guidelines for Churches in Determining How to Affect Government and Public Policy without Jeopardizing their Non-profit Status." Accessed November 11, 2018.
<https://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/D-Political-Guidelines-for-Churches-and-Pastors.pdf>.
- _____. "Stop Common Core "State" Standards: An Unconstitutional Experiment on Our Children." Accessed November 5, 2017. http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/CWA_StopCommonCore.pdf.
- _____. "Support for Israel." Accessed January 2, 2018.
<https://concernedwomen.org/issues/support-for-israel/>.
- _____. "Who We Are: Putting Families First." Accessed November 5, 2017.
<https://concernedwomen.org/about/who-we-are/>.
- _____. "Young Women for America." Accessed January 2, 2018.
<https://concernedwomen.org/special-projects/ywa/>.
- Cone, James H. *A Black Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2003.
- Conforti, Joseph. "The Invention of the Great Awakening, 1795-1842." *Early American Literature*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (1991): 99-118. Accessed August 23, 2021. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25056853>.
- Corbett, Michael and Julia Mitchell Corbett. *Politics and Religion in the United States*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.
- Cornell Law School: Legal Information Institute. "42 U.S. Code § 2000bb-1 - Free exercise of religion protected." Accessed January 15, 2018.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/2000bb-1>.
- _____. "Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc." Accessed November 11, 2018.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/13-354>.
- _____. "U.S. Constitution: First Amendment." Accessed October 18, 2017.
https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/first_amendment.
- _____. "United States Constitution: Preamble." Accessed November 6, 2017.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/preamble>.

- Cornish, Samuel E. and Theodore S. Wright. *The Colonization Scheme Considered in Its Rejection by the Colored People—In Its Tendency to Uphold Castes—In Its Unfitness for Christianizing and Civilizing the Aborigines of Africa and Putting a Stop to the African Slave Trade: In a Letter to the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen and the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler*. Newark: Printed by Aaron Guest, 1840. Accessed October 16, 2018. <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=FPpxAAAAMAAJ&hl=de&printsec=frontcover&pg=GBS.PP1>.
- Cox, Jeffrey. "Secularization and Other Master Narratives of Religion in Modern Europe," *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 14, No. 1, *Christliche Religion in der Geschichtsschreibung des 20. Jahrhunderts* (2001): 24-35. Accessed July 2, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43100018>.
- Cromartie, Michael, ed. *Disciples & Democracy: Religious Conservatives and the Future of American Politics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- Curran, Charles E. *Catholic Social Teaching 1891-Present: A Historical, Theological, And Ethical Analysis*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2002.
- Darby, Henry E. and Margaret N. Rowley. "King on Vietnam and beyond." *Phylon* (1960-), Vol. 47, No. 1 (1st Qtr., 1986): 43-50. Accessed November 14, 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/274693>.
- Dault, Kira. "What is the preferential option for the poor?" *U.S. Catholic Magazine: Faith In Real Life*, January 2015. Accessed October 20, 2017. <http://www.uscatholic.org/articles/201501/what-preferential-option-poor-29649>.
- Davis, Derek H. ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Dean, Virgil W. *An Opportunity Lost: The Truman Administration and the Farm Policy Debate*. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2006.
- Delk, Josh. "Analysis: Lobbying activity at highest level since 2010." *The Hill*, January 27, 2018. Accessed October 12, 2018. <https://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/business-a-lobbying/371033-lobbying-activity-at-highest-level-since-2010-report>.
- Demy, Timothy J. and Gary P. Stewart, eds. *Politics and Public Policy: A Christian Response*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2000.
- De Tocqueville, Alex. *Democracy in America*. Edited by J.P.Mayer. Translated by George Lawrence. Harper & Row, Publishers: London.
- _____. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Henry Reeve. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Outlook Verlag GmbH, 2018.

- Deutsch, Helen. *A Profile of American Women in the Twentieth Century*. Washington, D.C.: The Beverly LaHaye Institute, 2001. Accessed November 13, 2018, <http://concernedwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/gg1-72.pdf>.
- Deutsch, Kenneth L. and Joseph R. Fornieri. *An Invitation to Political Thought*. Belmont, CA: Thomas Wadworth, 2009.
- Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave*. Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, No. 25 Cornhill, 1845.
- Drutman, Lee. "The Business of America is Lobbying: Explaining the Growth of Corporate Political Activity in Washington, DC." *Techliberation*: 1-39. Accessed January 3, 2017, https://techliberation.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/business_of_america_is_lobbying.pdf.
- _____. "The Complexities of Lobbying: Toward a Deeper Understanding of the Profession." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (October 2010): 834-837. Accessed October 4, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40927084>.
- Dunaway, David K. and Willa K. Baum, eds. *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*. Nashville, TN: The American Association for State and Local History.
- Dunn, Charles W. *Religion in American Politics*. Washington, D.C.: Congress Quarterly Press, 1989.
- Dunn, Mary Maples. *William Penn: Politics and Conscience*. Princeton University: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Earl, Jr., Riggins R. *Dark Symbols, Obscure Signs: God, Self, and Community in the Slave Mind*. New York: Orbis Books, 1993.
- Ebersole, Luke E. *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1951.
- Estes, James M. *Peace, Order and the Glory of God: Secular Authority and the Church in the Thought of Luther and Melancthon, 1518-1559*. Boston: Brill Publishing, 2005.
- Ewing, Charles. *Publications of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, January 1879*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1874. Accessed July 25, 2017. <https://archive.org/stream/publicationsofbu00bure#page/n5/mode/2up>.
- Family Research Council. "Abortion." Accessed October 27, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/abortion>.

- _____. "Family Structure." Accessed October 27, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/family-structure>.
- _____. "History of the Family Research Council: Over Thirty Years of Advancing Faith, Family, and Freedom." Accessed October 29, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/historymission>.
- _____. "Homosexuality." Accessed October 27, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/homosexuality>.
- _____. "Human Sexuality," Accessed October 27, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/human-sexuality>.
- _____. "Life." Accessed October 27, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/Life>.
- _____. "Marriage and Family." Accessed October 27, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/Marriage-and-Family>.
- _____. "Pornography." Accessed October 30, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/pornography>.
- _____. "Pornography and Its Consequences." Accessed October 30, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/pornographyconsequences>.
- _____. "Religion in Public Life." Accessed October 30, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/religion-in-public-life>.
- _____. "Vision and Mission Statements." Accessed October 27, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/mission-statement>.
- Ferguson, Duncan S. *Biblical Hermeneutics: An Introduction*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1986.
- Finnis, J. *Natural Law and Natural Right*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Fleming, Walter L. "Forty Acres and a Mule." *The North American Review*, Vol. 182, No. 594 (May, 1906): 721-737. Accessed July 12, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25105565>.
- Focus on the Family: Helping Families Thrive. "About Focus on the Family." Accessed October 29, 2017. <http://www.focusonthefamily.com/about>.
- _____. "Foundational Values." Accessed November 4, 2017. <http://www.focusonthefamily.com/about/foundational-values>.
- Foner, Philip S. *The Life and Writing of Frederick Douglass, Volume III*. New York: The International Publishing Company, Inc., 1950.

- Fones-Wolf, Elizabeth and Ken Fones-Wolf. "Lending a Hand to Labor: James Myers and the Federal Council of Churches." 1926-1947, *Church History* Vol. 68, No. 1 (Mar., 1999): 81. Accessed September 5, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3170110>.
- Forrer, Richard. *Theodicies in Conflict: A Dilemma In Puritan Ethics and Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Fowler, Robert Booth, Allen D. Hertzke, Laura R. Olson, and Kevin R. Den Dulk. *Religion and Politics in America: Faith, Culture, and Strategic Choices*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2010.
- Friends Committee on National Legislation. "Who We Are." Accessed September 18, 2017. <https://www.fcnl.org/about/who>.
- Fritz, Henry E. "The Making of Grants Peace Policy." *The Chronicles of Oklahoma*, Volume 37, No. 4 (1959): 411- 432. Accessed July 25, 2017. <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Chronicles/v037/v037p411.pdf>.
- Furbay, Harvey Graeme. "The Anti-Saloon League." *The North American Review*, Vol. 177, No. 562 (Sep., 1903): 434-439. Accessed September 5, 2021. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25119451>.
- Giffin, Frederick C. "Billy Sunday: The Evangelist as 'Patriot,'" *Social Science* Vol. 48, No. 4 (Autumn 1973): 216-221. Accessed September 4, 2021. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41959648>.
- Giuseppe Mastromatteo and Stefano Solari, "The Idea Of 'Common Good' and the Role of the State in Present Day Social Economics." *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, Anno 122, No. 1 (Gennaio-Marzo 2014): 85-102. Accessed October 12, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43830201>.
- Gladden, Washington. *The Christian Way: Whither It Leads And How To God On*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company Publishers, 1877.
- Goldie, Mark and Robert Wokler, eds. *The Cambridge History of the Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Goldstein, Kenneth M. *Interest Groups, Lobbying, and Participation in America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- González, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity: The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2010.
- Graff, Alison. "January Series 2009: Church and state in Calvinist Geneva." Calvin College, January 8, 2009. Accessed November 13, 2018. <https://calvin.edu/news/archive/january-series-2009-church-and-state-in-calvinist-geneva>.

- Grimm, Harold J. "Luther's Conception of Territorial and National Loyalty," *Church History*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Jun., 1948): 79-94. Accessed July 4, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3160469>.
- Groody, Daniel G. and Gustavo A. Gutierrez, eds. *The Preferential Option for the Poor Beyond Theology*. Notre Dame, IL: University of Notre Dame Press, 2014.
- Grunderson, Gerald. "The Origin of the American Civil War." *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Dec., 1974): 915-950. Accessed November 2, 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2116615>.
- Gruson, Lindsey. "MAN IN THE NEWS; The New Face of the Right: Alfredo Cristiani." *New York Times*, March 21, 1989. Accessed December 5, 2017. <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/03/21/world/man-in-the-news-the-new-face-of-the-right-alfredo-cristiani.html>.
- Hall, Charles F. "The Christian Left: Who Are They and How They Are Different from the Christian Right?" *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Sep. 1997): 27-45. Accessed October 19, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3512477>.
- Hansen, John Mark. *Gaining Access: Congress and the Farm Lobby, 1919-1981*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Hauerwas, Stanley and William H. Willimon. *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2014.
- Hendley, Sarah and Kimberly Mazcyk. "A 'Month' of Poverty." *Charities USA: The Magazine of Catholic Charities USA*, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Summer 2018): 22-23. Accessed August 2, 2018. https://www.catholiccharitiesusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CharitiesUSA-Summer-2018_web.pdf.
- Hendricks, Jr., Obery M. *The Politics of Jesus: Rediscovering the True Revolutionary Nature of Jesus' Teaching and How They Have Been Corrupted*. New York: Three Leaves Press, 2006.
- Henry, Chadwick. *The Early Church: The story of emergent Christianity from the apostolic age to the dividing of ways between the Greek East and the Latin West*. London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1993.
- Herman, Stewart W. "Luther, Law, and Social Covenants: Cooperative Self-Obligation in the Reconstruction of Lutheran Social Ethics," *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Fall, 1997): 257-275. Accessed April 13, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40015224>.
- Herring, George C. *From Colony To Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- Hertzke, Allen D. *Lobbying for the faithful: Religious advocacy groups in Washington, D.C.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center: The Pew Forum On Religion & Public Life, 2012. Accessed March 21, 2015. http://www.pewforum.org/files/2011/11/ReligiousAdvocacy_web.pdf.
- _____. "The role and effectiveness of religious lobbies: A response to Robert Zwier." In *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, edited by W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 121-129. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc., 1994.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Hollenbach, S.J., David. *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hough Jr., Joseph C. "Christian Social Ethics as Advocacy." *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Spring, 1977): 115-133. Accessed November 9, 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40020366>.
- Höpfl, Harro, ed. *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Hrebenar, Ronald J. and Bryson B. Morgan. *Lobbying in America: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2009.
- Huberman, Leo. *Man's Worldly Goods: The Story of the Wealth of Nations*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1936.
- Hula, Kevin W. *Lobbying Together: Interest Group Coalitions in Legislative Politics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1999).
- Internal Revenue Service. "'Direct' and 'Grass Roots' Lobbying Defined." Last modified March 18, 2016. Accessed December 6, 2016. <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/direct-and-grass-roots-lobbying-defined>.
- _____. "Lobbying." Last modified March 4, 2016. Accessed January 3, 2017. <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/lobbying>.
- _____. "The Restriction of Political Campaign Intervention by Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Organizations." Last modified November 5, 2018. Accessed November 14, 2018. <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/the-restriction-of-political-campaign-intervention-by-section-501c3-tax-exempt-organizations>.

- Investopedia. "Political Action Committee / Super PAC." Accessed October 12, 2018, <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/political-action-committee-super-pac.asp>.
- Irvin, Benjamin H. *Clothed in Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People out of doors*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Jackson, J. C. "The Work of the Anti-Saloon League." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 32, Regulation of the Liquor Traffic (Nov., 1908):12. Accessed September 5, 2021 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1010548>.
- James, Winston. *The Struggles of John Brown Russwurm: The Life and Writings of a Pan-Africanist Pioneer, 1799-1851*. New York: New York University Press, 2010.
- Jeanrond, Werner G. "From Resistance to Liberation Theology: German Theologians and the Non/ Resistance to the National Socialist Regime," *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 64, Supplement: Resistance Against the Third Reich (Dec., 1992): S187-S203. Accessed July 1, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2124977>.
- Jefferson, Thomas. "The Papers of Jefferson, Volume 35: 1 August to 30 November 1801." Princeton University. Accessed October 12, 2018, <https://jeffersonpapers.princeton.edu/selected-documents/danbury-baptist-association>.
- Johnson, Andrew. "Veto of the Civil Rights Bill, March 27, 1866." In *Andrew Johnson, His Life and Speeches*, by Lillian Foster. New York: Richardson & Company, 1866. Accessed July 11, 2017. <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/veto-of-the-civil-rights-bill/>.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Antiquities of the Jews, Book XV*.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited by Mary Gregor and Jens Timmerman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Kettern, B. *Principles of Catholic Social Teaching*. Edited by David A. Boileau. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994.
- King Jr., Martin Luther. *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1958.
- King, William McGuire. "'History as Revelation' in the Theology of the Social Gospel," *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 76, No. 1 (Jan., 1983): 109-129. Accessed July 4, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1509439>.
- Kintz, Linda and Julia Lesage, eds. *Media, Culture, & the Religious Right*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

- Koehler, Sebastian. *Lobbying, Political Uncertainty and Policy Outcomes*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2010.
- Kostenberger, Andreas. "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and Family." Family Research Council. Accessed November 4, 2017. <http://www.frc.org/brochure/the-bibles-teaching-on-marriage-and-family>.
- Kramer, S.J., Fred. "Catholic Social Teaching and Distributive Justice." *JustSouth Quarterly* Spring 2010: 3. Accessed November 11, 2018. http://loyno.edu/jsri/sites/loyno.edu.jsri/files/CST_Distributive_Justice.pdf.
- Kurtz, Lester and Kelly G. Fulton. "Love your enemies? Protestants and United State foreign policy." In *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism And the Public Role Of Mainline Protestantism*, edited by R. Wuthnow & J. H. Evans, 364-380. Berkley, California: University of California Press, 2002.
- Kvale, Steinar and Svend Brinkmann. *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage Publications, 2009.
- Ladd, George Elden. *The Gospel of the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.
- LaHaye, Beverly. *Who But A Woman?* Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984.
- Lansing, Paul and Sarosh Kuruvilla. "Business Divestment in South Africa: In Who's Best Interest?" *Journal of Business Ethics*, 7(8) (1988): 561. Accessed October 8, 2018. <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=2102&context=articles>.
- LaPira, Timothy M. and Herschel F. Thomas. *Revolving Door Lobbying: Public Service, Private Influence, and the Unequal Representation of Interest*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2017.
- Lee, Diana. "Assessing the Relationship Between Gun Violence and Health Equity." Bethune-Cookman University. Accessed November 9, 2018. <https://www.cookman.edu/newsInfo/newsroom/newsReleases/2016/assessing-the-relationship-between-gun-violence-and-health-equity.html>.
- Library of Congress. "14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution." Accessed July 11, 2017. <https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/14thamendment.html>.
- _____. "Declaring Independence: Drafting Documents – Jefferson's 'Original Rough Draft' of the Declaration of Independence," Accessed October 20, 2018. <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/declara/ruffdrft.html>.
- _____. "Free Blacks in the Antebellum Period." African American Odyssey: Library of Congress. Accessed October 20, 2018. <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/aohtml/exhibit/aopart2.html>.

- _____. "Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists." Accessed October 16, 2018.
<https://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html>.
- _____. "Lincoln and Frederick Douglass - With Malice Toward None: The Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Exhibition." Accessed July 3, 2017.
<https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/lincoln/lincoln-and-frederick-douglass.html>.
- _____. "Missouri Compromise." Accessed October 20, 2018.
<https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/missouri.html>.
- _____. "The Articles of Confederation." Accessed October 16, 2018.
<https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/articles.html>.
- _____. "The Civil Rights Act of 1964: The Long Struggle for Freedom." Accessed July 26, 2017. <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/civil-rights-act/civil-rights-act-of-1964.html>.
- Lincoln, Abraham. *Selected Speeches and Writings*. New York, NY: First Library of America Paperback Classics, 2009.
- _____. "The Gettysburg Address." Abraham Lincoln Online. Accessed January 10, 2017. <http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm>.
- Liptak, Adam. "Supreme Court Rejects Contraception Mandate for Some Corporations." *New York Times*, June 30, 2014. Accessed July 15, 2018.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/01/us/hobby-lobby-case-supreme-court-contraception.html>.
- Liverpool City Council. "Social Justice." Accessed November 9, 2018.
<https://www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au/community/social-justice>.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Mark Goldie. London: Everyman, 1924.
- Loewen, James W. "Five Myths About Why the South Seceded." *Washington Post*, February 6, 2011. Accessed July 7, 2017.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/five-myths-about-why-the-south-seceded/2011/01/03/ABHr6jD_story.html?utm_term=.5f1fc412292e.
- Logan, Edward B. and Simon N. Patten Fellow. "Lobbying." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 144, Supplement (Jul., 1929): i-iii+v+1-91. Accessed September 29, 2016.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1017495>.
- Lugo, Luis E., ed. *Religion, Public Life, and the American Polity*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1994.

- Lupfer, Jacob. "The rise and fall and rise of the National Council of Churches (Commentary)." Religious News Service, September 26, 2014. Accessed September 4, 2021. <https://religionnews.com/2014/09/26/rise-fall-rise-national-council-churches-commentary/>.
- Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs (LOGA). "Our Mission Statement and Our Work." Accessed October 16, 2017. <https://www.loga.org/mission.html>.
- Madison, James. "The Federalist No. 10." *The New York Packet*, Friday, November 23, 1787. Yale Law School: The Avalon Project. Accessed August 8, 2016. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed10.asp.
- Mann, Horace. "Lectures on Education." *Schools: Studies in Education*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Fall 2009): 226-240. Accessed August 23, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1086/605997>.
- Mansbridge, Jane J. "A Deliberative Theory of Interest Representation." In *The Politics of Interests: Interest Groups Transformed*, edited by Mark P. Petracca. Oxford: Westview Press, 1992.
- Mantler, Gordon K. *Power to the Poor: Black-Brown Coalition and the Fight for Economic Justice, 1960-1974*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- Marshall, Susan E. "Who Speaks for Women? The Future of Anti-Feminism." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 515, American Feminism: New Issues for a Mature Movement (May, 1991): 50-62. Accessed December 2, 2017. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1046927>.
- Masci, David. "Darwinism in America: The evolution debate in the United States." Pew Research Center, February 6, 2019. Accessed September 3, 2021. <https://www.pewforum.org/essay/darwin-in-america/>.
- Matthews, Donald G. "The Second Great Awakening as an Organizing Process, 1780-1830: An Hypothesis," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring, 1969): 23-43. Accessed August 22, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2710771>.
- Mayer, Lloyd Hitoshi. "What Is This 'Lobbying' That We Are so Worried About?" *Yale Law & Policy Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Spring, 2008): 485-566. Accessed February 17, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40239700>.
- Mays, Benjamin E. *Born to Rebel, An Autobiography*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.
- McFarland, Andrew S. "Interest Groups and Theories of Power in America." *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Apr., 1987):129-147. Accessed October 12, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/193940>.

- McGinty, Robert. "American Influences on the Northern Ireland Peace Process." *The Journal of Conflict Studies*, Vol. XVII No. 2, Fall 1997. Accessed November 11, 2018. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/jcs/article/view/11750/12521>.
- McGuinness, Colleen, ed. *The Washington Lobby: Fifth Edition*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1987.
- McKanan, Dan. *Prophetic Encounters: Religion and the American Radical Tradition*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 2011.
- McKay, Amy Melissa. "The decision to lobby bureaucrats." *Public Choice*, Vol. 147, No. 1/2 (April 2011): 123-138. Accessed July 29, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41483649>.
- McKittrick, David and David McVea. *Making Sense of the Troubles: A History of the Northern Ireland Conflict*. London: Penguin Books, 2000.
- McNeill, John T. "The Democratic Element in Calvin's Thought," *Church History*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Sep., 1949): 153-171. Accessed January 4, 2019. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3162238>.
- Messer, Donald E. *Christian Ethics and Political Action*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1984.
- Mintz, Steven. *Moralists & Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Crucified God*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015.
- _____. *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Monsma, Stephen. *Pursuing Justice In A Sinful World*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984.
- Moore, Russell. "Is Pro-Life Winning?" *Light Magazine: Kingdom, Culture, Mission*, Vol. 1, Issue 2 (Winter 2015): 1. Accessed August 2, 2018, https://d1nwfrzxhi18dp.cloudfront.net/uploads/resource_library/attachment/file/2/Winter_2015_Light_Magazine_-_Web.pdf.
- Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1988.
- NAACP. "The Nations Premier Civil Rights Organization." Accessed November 7, 2018. <https://www.naacp.org/nations-premier-civil-rights-organization/>.
- National Association of Evangelicals. "History – National Association of Evangelicals." Accessed September 4, 2021. <https://www.nae.net/about-nae/history/>.

- National Council of Churches. "History." Accessed September 5, 2021. <https://nationalcouncilofchurches.us/about-us/history/>.
- _____. "Social Creed." Accessed September 5, 2021. <https://nationalcouncilofchurches.us/common-witness/1908/social-creed.php>.
- National Education Association. "Background on Common Core State Standards." Accessed November 11, 2018. <http://www.nea.org/home/56612.htm>.
- National Relations Labor Board. "National Labor Relations Act." Accessed September 5, 2021. <https://www.nlr.gov/guidance/key-reference-materials/ley-de-relaciones-obrero-patronales>.
- Natsios, Andrew. *U.S Foreign Policy and the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Humanitarian Relief in Complex Emergencies*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1997.
- _____. "NGOs and the UN system in complex humanitarian emergencies: Conflict or cooperation?" *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 3, Nongovernmental Organizations, the United Nations and Global Governance (Sep., 1995): 405-419. Accessed July 15, 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3992884>.
- Newman, Dorothy K., Nancy J. Amidei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Krivant, and Jack S. Russell, *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940-75*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Newman, Mark. *The Civil Rights Movement*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- New Georgia Encyclopedia. "Abraham Baldwin 1754-1807." Accessed October 16, 2018. <http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-archaeology/abraham-baldwin-1754-1807>.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1951.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. New York: Charles Schibner's Sons, 1932.
- _____. *The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of its Traditional Defence*. New York: Charles Schibner's Sons, 1944.
- _____. *The Nature and Destiny of Man: Human Nature Volume 1*. New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1941.
- Noll, Mark A, ed. *Religion & American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

- Novak, Michael. *Social Justice: Not What You Think It Is*. Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation, 2009. Accessed October 18, 2017.
<http://www.heritage.org/poverty-and-inequality/report/social-justice-not-what-you-think-it>.
- Obar, Jonathan A., Paul Zube and Clifford Lampe. "Advocacy 2.0: An Analysis of How Advocacy Groups in the United States Perceive and Use Social Media as Tools for Facilitating Civic Engagement and Collective Action." *Journal of Information Policy*, Vol. 2 (2012): 1-25. Accessed December 17, 2016.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/10.5325/jinfopoli.2.2012.0001.pdf>.
- Offutt, Stephen, F. David Bronkema, Krisanne Vaillancourt Murphy, Robb Davis, and Gregg Okesson. *Advocating for Justice: An Evangelical Vision for Transforming Systems and Structures*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Oldfield, Duane Murray. *The Right and the Righteous*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1996.
- Olson, Laura. "Mainline Protestant Washington offices and the political lives of clergy." In *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*, edited by R. Wuthnow & J. H. Evans, 54-79. Berkley, California: University of California Press, 2002.
- Patterson, Thomas E. *The American Democracy: Second Edition*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc., 1993.
- Payne, Daniel Alexander. *Recollection of Seventy Years*. Nashville, Tennessee: Publishing House of the A.M.E. Sunday School Union, 1888. Documenting the South: University of North Carolina. Accessed July 4, 2018.
<http://docsouth.unc.edu/church/payne70/payne.html>.
- Perks, Robert and Alistair Thomson, eds. *The Oral History Reader: Third Edition*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Phelps, Glen A. "George Washington and the Founding of the Presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Bicentennial Issue: The Origins and Invention of the American Presidency (SPRING 1987): 345-363. Accessed October 16, 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40574456>.
- Pachamama. "What is Social Justice?" Accessed November 9, 2018.
<https://www.pachamama.org/social-justice/what-is-social-justice>.
- Paeth, Scott R. "Jürgen Moltmann's Public Theology," *Political Theology Journal* Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2005: 215-234. Accessed July 1, 2019.
https://www.academia.edu/4672278/J%C3%9CRGEN_MOLTMANNNS_PUBLIC_THEOLOGY.

- Parrish, John M. "Two Cities And Two Loves: Imitation In Augustine's Moral Psychology And Political Theory," *History of Political Thought*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Summer 2005): 209-235. Accessed July 2, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26221693>.
- Powers, Gerard F., Drew Christiansen, S.J., and Robert T. Hennemeyer eds. *Peacemaking: Moral and Policy Challenges for a New World*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1994.
- Pratt, Henry J. "The Growth of Political Activism in the National Council of Churches." *The Review of Politics* Vol. 34, No. 3 (Jul., 1972): 323-341. Accessed September 5, 2021. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/140649>.
- Presbyterian Church U.S.A. "Office of Public Witness." Accessed October 16, 2017, <https://www.presbyterianmission.org/ministries/compassion-peace-justice/washington/>.
- Ragsdale, Jr., W. B. Review of *The Growing Church Lobby in Washington* by James L. Adams. *Journal of Church and State*, 13 (2), (1971): 358-359. Accessed November 14, 2018. <http://jcs.oxfordjournals.org/>.
- Randell, Keith. *Luther and the German Reformation 1517-55*. London: Hodder Education, 1989.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter. *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1917.
- _____. *Christianizing the Social Order*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1926.
- _____. *Dare We Be Christians*. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1914.
- Robinson, Zoë. "Lobbying in the Shadows: Religious Interests Groups in the Legislative Process," *Emory Law Journal* Vol. 64 (2015): 1041-1102. Accessed September 11, 2017. http://law.emory.edu/elj/_documents/volumes/64/4/articles/robinson.pdf.
- Rossinow, Doug. "The Radicalization of the Social Gospel: Harry F. Ward and the Search for a New Social Order, 1898-1936." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter2005): 63-106. Accessed March 23, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/rac.2005.15.1.63>.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract and Discourses*. Translated by G. D. H. Cole. Vermont: Everyman, 1913.
- Ryan, James H. "National Catholic Welfare Council." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* Vol. 12, No. 45 (Mar., 1923): 120-131. Accessed September 25, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30093161>.

- Sawyer, Mary. "The Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, 1934-1964." *Church History* Vol. 59, No. 1 (Mar., 1990): 52. Accessed September 6, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3169085>.
- Schadler, B. Holly. *The Connection: Strategies for Creating and Operating 501(c)(3)s, 501(c)(4)s and Political Organizations Third Edition*. Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Justice, 2012. Accessed November 14, 2018. https://www.bolderadvocacy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/The_Connection.pdf.
- Schiller, Ben. "Learning Their Letters: Critical Literacy, Epistolary Culture, and Slavery in the Antebellum South." *Southern Quarterly* 45.3 (2008): 11-29. Accessed October 20, 2018. http://www.academia.edu/1283185/Learning_their_letters_Critical_literacy_epistolary_culture_and_slavery_in_the_Antebellum_South.
- Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur. "Rheinhold Niebuhr's Long Shadow." *New York Times*, June 22, 1992. Accessed November 14, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/1992/06/22/opinion/reinhold-niebuhr-s-long-shadow.html>.
- Schmidt, Susan and James V. Grimaldi. "The Fast Rise and Steep Fall of Jack Abramoff." *Washington Post*, December 29, 2005. Accessed January 10, 2017. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/28/AR2005122801588_5.html.
- Schmitt, Carl. *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Translated by George Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Schökel, Luis Alonso. *A Manuel of Hermeneutics*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Separation of Church and State. "The Danbury Baptist Letter to Thomas Jefferson." Accessed October 16, 2018. <http://candst.tripod.com/tnppage/baptist.htm>.
- Shahin, Jessica. "The Many Reasons USDA is Celebrating 50 Years of SNAP." U.S. Department of Agriculture. Accessed November 9, 2018. <https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2014/11/20/many-reasons-usda-celebrating-50-years-snap>.
- Shiels, Richard D. "The Second Great Awakening in Connecticut: Critique of the Traditional Interpretation." *Church History* Vol. 49, No. 4 (Dec., 1980): 401-415. Accessed August 25, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3164815>.
- Short, Nancy M. "Influencing Health Policy: Strategies for Nursing Education to Partner with Nursing Practice." *Journal of Professional Nursing*, Vol. 24, No. 5 (September-October), 2008: 265-269. Accessed December 17, 2016. http://ac.els-cdn.com/S8755722307002372/1-s2.0-S8755722307002372-main.pdf?_tid=121ae52a-c480-11e6-a5fc-00000aab0f26&acdnat=1481996682_0f77777571b422fd300b4f32d2271899.

- Simon, Arthur. *Christian Faith & Public Policy: No Grounds for Divorce*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.
- _____. *Rediscovering the Lord's Prayer*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Books, 2005.
- _____. *Rising of Bread for the World: An Outcry of Citizens Against Hunger*. New York: Paulist Press, 2009.
- Simon, Paul and Arthur Simon. *The Politics of World Hunger*. New York: Harpers Magazine Press, 1973.
- Sina, Manisha. *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Skinner, Elliot P. *African Americans and U.S. Policy Toward Africa 1850-1924: In Defense of Black Nationality*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1992.
- Slawson, Douglas J. *The Foundation and First Decade of the National Catholic Welfare Council*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press of America, 1992.
- Sockness, Brent W. "Luther's Two Kingdoms Revisited: A Response to Reinhold Niebuhr's Criticism of Luther," *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Spring, 1992): 93-110. Accessed April 13, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40015143>.
- Sojourners. "What We Cover." Accessed October 20, 2017. <https://sojo.net/about-us/what-we-cover>.
- _____. "Who We Are." Accessed October 19, 2017. <https://sojo.net/about-us/who-we-are>.
- Southern Baptist Convention. "Resolution On Racial Reconciliation On The 150th Anniversary Of The Southern Baptist Convention - Atlanta, Georgia – 1995." Accessed October 16, 2018. <http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/899/resolution-on-racial-reconciliation-on-the-150th-anniversary-of-the-southern-baptist-convention>.
- Southern Christian Leadership Conference. "SCLC History." Accessed July 23, 2017, <http://nationalsclc.org/about-us/history/>.
- Spragens, Jr., Thomas A. "The Antinomies of Social Justice." *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Spring, 1993): 193-216. Accessed November 9, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1407878>.
- Stevenson, William R. Jr., ed. *Christian Political Activism at Crossroads*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1994.

- Sutton, William R. "Benevolent Calvinism and the Moral Government of God: The Influence of Nathaniel W. Taylor on Revivalism in the Second Great Awakening." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter, 1992): 23-47. Accessed August 23, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1124013>.
- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 2007.
- Taylor, Clarence. *Black Religious Intellectuals: The Fight for Equality from Jim Crow to the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2002.
- The Catholic University of America. "The National Catholic War Council: An Inventory of Records of the National Catholic War Council at the American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives." Accessed September 25, 2017. <http://archives.lib.cua.edu/findingaid/NCWarCouncil.cfm#IDEYAEHMKV0XYKLMDBZG3WKJSNAHIQITEPJZNFCEELJVGFGHMS2AO>.
- _____. "United States Conference of Catholic Bishops Office of the General Secretary: An Inventory of the Records of the Office of the General Secretary at The American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives." Accessed November 11, 2018. <http://archives.lib.cua.edu/findingaid/nwcogs.cfm>.
- The Center for Economic and Social Justice. "Defining Economic Justice and Social Justice." Accessed October 18, 2017. <http://www.cesj.org/learn/definitions/defining-economic-justice-and-social-justice/>.
- The Episcopal Church. "The Office of Government Relations." Accessed October 16, 2017. <https://www.episcopalchurch.org/office-government-relations>.
- "The Equal Rights Amendment." *Women's Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 3/4, THE 1970s (FALL/WINTER 2015): 271. Accessed November 9, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43958572>.
- The Evangelical Lutheran Church of America: God's Work. Our Hands. "Advocacy." Accessed October 16, 2017. <http://www.elca.org/Our-Work/Publicly-Engaged-Church/Advocacy>.
- The Free Online Library. "The origins of the Southern Baptist Convention: a historiographical study: the purpose of this paper is to describe how white Baptist church historians of the South have interpreted the founding of the Southern Baptist Convention since 1845." Accessed October 16, 2017. <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/The+origins+of+the+Southern+Baptist+Convention%3A+a+historiographical...-a094160891>.

- The Georgia Historical Society. "Abraham Baldwin: Early Years 1754-1779." Accessed October 16, 2018. <http://georgiahistory.com/education-outreach/online-exhibits/featured-historical-figures/abraham-baldwin/baldwin-early-years/>.
- The Supreme Court of the United States of America. "BURWELL, SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL. v. HOBBY LOBBY STORES, INC., ET AL." Accessed November 11, 2018. https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/13pdf/13-354_olp1.pdf.
- Thoreau, Henry David. *Civil Disobedience (1849)*. University of Virginia. Accessed November 14, 2018. <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~hyper2/thoreau/civil.html>.
- Thurman, Howard. *Jesus and the Disinherited*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *The Kingdom of God Is Within You: Christianity Not As A Mystic Religion But As A New Theory of Life*. Translated by Constance Garnett. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.
- Tyrrell, Ian. "Temperance, feminism, and the WCTU: New interpretations and new directions." *Australasian Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (December 1986): 27-36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41053417>.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. *Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation 1863-1963: A Report the President by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. "About USCCB." Accessed September 19, 2017. <http://www.usccb.org/about/>.
- _____. "A Jubilee Call for Debt Forgiveness: A Statement by the Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference." Accessed December 11, 2017. <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/debt-relief/jubilee-debt-forgiveness.cfm>.
- _____. "Catholic Social Teaching." Accessed November 18, 2018. <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/index.cfm>.
- _____. "Ecumenical Initiatives on Northern Ireland." Accessed December 11, 2017. <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/global-issues/europe/northern-ireland/ecumenical-initiatives-on-northern-ireland-1998-1999.cfm>.
- _____. "Government Relations." Accessed October 9, 2017. <http://www.usccb.org/about/government-relations/>.
- _____. "Refugee Resettlement." Accessed November 27, 2017. <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/migrants-refugees-and-travelers/refugee-resettlement/index.cfm>.

- _____. "Two Feet of Love in Action." Accessed November 13, 2018.
<http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/two-feet-of-love-in-action.cfm>.
- _____. "United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Affiliates: Consolidated Financial Statements with Supplemental Schedules December 31, 2016 and 2015." Accessed November 23, 2017, <http://www.usccb.org/about/financial-reporting/upload/financial-statements-2015-2016.pdf>.
- _____. "USCCB Mission: General Mission Goals of the USCCB." Accessed October 9, 2017. <http://www.usccb.org/about/usccb-mission.cfm>.
- United States Congress. "Biographical Data of the United States Congress: 1774-Present." Accessed October 16, 2018.
<http://bioguide.congress.gov/biosearch/biosearch.asp>.
- United States Department of Agriculture: Food and Nutrition Service. "Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)." Accessed November 9, 2018.
<https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic/women-infants-and-children-wic>.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services: Office of Family Assistance. "About TANF." Last modified June 28, 2017. Accessed November 9, 2018. <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ofa/programs/tanf/about>.
- United States Senate. "Lobbying." Accessed August 19, 2016.
http://www.senate.gov/reference/reference_index_subjects/Lobbying_vrd.htm.
- _____. "The Kansas-Nebraska Act." Accessed October 20, 2018.
https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/minute/Kansas_Nebraska_Act.htm.
- University of Michigan. "Chronology of the Life of Saint Augustine, Bishop of Hippo (A.D. 354-430)." Accessed November 13, 2018. <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~rdwallin/syl/GreatBooks/202.W99/Augustine/AugustineChron.html>.
- Urofsky, Melvin I. "Jim Crow law: United States [1877-1945]." Encyclopedia Britannica. Accessed July 11, 2017. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Jim-Crow-law>.
- Urofsky, Melvin I. and Martha May, eds. *The New Christian Right: Political and Social Issues*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1996.
- USAID. "U.S. Foreign Aid by Country." Accessed January 2, 2018.
https://explorer.usaid.gov/cd/ISR?fiscal_year=2016&measure=Obligations.
- U.S. Constitution. "United States Constitution Amendment 1 – Freedom of Religion, Press, Expression." Accessed October 16, 2018.
https://www.usconstitution.net/xconst_Am1.html.

- U.S. History. "First Continental Congress." Accessed October 16, 2018, <http://www.ushistory.org/declaration/related/congress.html>.
- _____. "Second Continental Congress." Accessed October 16, 2018. <http://www.ushistory.org/us/10e.asp>.
- Utter, Glenn H. and John W. Storey. *The Religious Right*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO Press, 1995.
- Vandrunen, David. "The Two Kingdoms Doctrine and the Relationship of Church and State in Early Reformed Tradition," *Journal of Church and State*, Vol. 49, No. 4 (Autumn 2007): 743-763. Accessed April 13, 2019. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23922304>.
- Wagner, John and Sarah Pulliam Bailey. "Trump signs order seeking to allow churches to engage in more political activity." *Washington Post*, May 4, 2017. Accessed July 20, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-signs-order-aimed-at-allowing-churches-to-engage-in-more-political-activity/2017/05/04/024ed7c2-30d3-11e7-9534-00e4656c22aa_story.html?utm_term=.63c506ca501e.
- Wald, Kenneth D. ed. *Religion and Politics in the United States: Second Edition*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1992.
- Walker, Andrew and Eric Teetsel. *Marriage Is: How Marriage Transforms Society and Cultivates Human Flourishing*. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 2015. In *Light Magazine: Kingdom, Culture, Mission, Vol. 1*, Issue 1 (Summer 2015): 30-31. Accessed August 2, 2018. https://d1nwfrzxhi18dp.cloudfront.net/uploads/resource_library/attachment/file/31/Light_Magazine_-_Summer_2015_-_Web.pdf.
- Wall, Donald D. "The Confessing Church and the Second World War." *Journal of Church and State*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Winter 1981): 15-34. Accessed November 13, 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23915897>.
- Walls, Andrew F. Walls. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1996.
- Wallis, Jim. *God's Politics: Why the Right Gets It Wrong and The Left Doesn't Get It*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 2005.
- Walsham, Alexandra. "The Reformation and 'The Disenchantment of the World' Reassessed," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Jun., 2008): 497-528. Accessed July 3, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20175171>.
- Walvin, James. "The slave trade, Quakers, and the early day of British abolition." In *Quakers and Abolition* Carey, edited by Brycchan Carey and Geoffry Plank, 165-178. Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

- Warnock, Raphael G. *The Divided Mind of the Black Church: Theology, Piety and Public Witness*. New York: New York University Press, 2014.
- Washington, H.A., ed. *The Writing of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. 6*. Frankfurt am Main: Outlook Verlag, GmbH, 2018.
- Watson, Hope. "Washington gathering empowers a new generation for social justice." Bread for the World Blog, June 23, 2016. Accessed October 18, 2017. <http://www.bread.org/blog/washington-gathering-empowers-new-generation-social-justice>.
- Watson, Justin. *The Christian Coalition: Dreams of Restoration, Demands for Recognition*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Weber, Paul J. Review of *Representing God in Washington: The Role of Religious Lobbies in the American Polity* by Allen D. Hertzke. *Journal of Law and Religion*, Vol. 8, No.1/2 (1990): 479-484. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1051306>.
- Weber, Paul J. and W. L. Jones. *U.S. Religious Interest Groups: Institutional Profiles*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Weir, David A. *Early New England: A Covenanted Society*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2005.
- Werning, David. "Feeding the Hungry." *Charities USA: The Magazine of Catholic Charities USA*, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Summer 2018): 8-9. Accessed August 2, 2018. https://www.catholiccharitiesusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CharitiesUSA-Summer-2018_web.pdf.
- Wesley, John. *Thoughts upon Slavery*. London: Joseph Crukshank, 1774.
- Wiencek, Henry. "The Dark Side of Thomas Jefferson: A New Portrait of the Founding Father Challenges the Long-held Perception of Thomas Jefferson as a Benevolent Slaveholder." *Smithsonian Magazine*, October 2012. Accessed October 20, 2018. <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/the-dark-side-of-thomas-jefferson-35976004/?page=2>.
- Wilcox, Clyde. *Onward Christian Soldiers? The Religious Right in American Politics*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996.
- Williams, Yohuru. *Black Politics/White Power: Civil Rights, Black Power, and the Black Panthers in New Haven*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

- Wilson, John F. "The Founding Era (1774–1797) and the Constitutional Provision for Religion." In *The Oxford Handbook of Church and State in the United States*, edited by Derek H. Davis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Wilson, Megan R. "Lobbying's top 50: Who's Spending big." *The Hill*, February 7, 2017. Accessed October 10, 2018. <https://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/business-a-lobbying/318177-lobbyings-top-50-whos-spending-big/>.
- Witte, Jr., John and Joel A. Nichols. *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment: Fourth Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Wolpe, Bruce C. *Lobbying Congress: How the System Works*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1990.
- Wood, Jr., James E. "Church Lobbying and Public Policy." *Journal of Church and State*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (SPRING 1986): 183-192. Accessed October 10, 2018, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23917653>.
- Wright, John R. *Interest Groups and Congress: Lobbying Contributions and Influence*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1996.
- Wuthnow, R. & J. H. Evans, eds. *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism And the Public Role Of Mainline Protestantism*. Berkley, California: University of California Press, 2002.
- Yale Law School. "Articles of Confederation : March 1, 1781." The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. Accessed October 16, 2018. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/artconf.asp.
- Yeager, D. M. "Focus on the Social Gospel: An Introduction," *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Spring, 1990): 3-6. Accessed July 4, 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40017825>
- Yow, Valerie Raleigh. *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*. London: Sage Publications, 1994.
- Zwier, Robert. "An organizational perspective on religious interest groups." In *Christian Political Activism at the Crossroads*, edited by W. R. Stevenson, Jr., 95-119. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc., 1994.