

5-4-2007

Civil Religion and Pastoral Power in the George W. Bush Presidency

Kristina E. Curry

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Curry, Kristina E., "Civil Religion and Pastoral Power in the George W. Bush Presidency." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2007.
https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses/23

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

CIVIL RELIGION AND PASTORAL POWER
IN THE GEORGE W. BUSH PRESIDENCY

by

KRISTINA E. CURRY

Under the Direction of James F. Darsey

ABSTRACT

American presidents have maintained an equilibrium between the role of church and state in government affairs via the nation's civil religion and a "rhetorical contract" between those secular and sacred interests. While other presidents have incorporated religion in their rhetorical execution of office, George W. Bush has done so in a manner different from his predecessors, emphasizing the role of faith in his administration's beliefs, actions, and policies. Such rhetoric upsets the tenuous relationship between sectarian and secular affairs. Bush's breach of the rhetorical contract can be explained by Foucault's notion of pastoral power. Using practices once associated with the church, the savvy government leader may better control his public. I argue that President Bush has shifted the balance of power between organized religion and government, specifically by means of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, thereby corrupting traditional notions of civil religion in the process of implementing his unique form of new pastoral power.

INDEX WORDS: George W. Bush, Civil religion, Pastoral power, American presidency,
Roderick Hart, Michel Foucault, Robert Bellah

CIVIL RELIGION AND PASTORAL POWER
IN THE GEORGE W. BUSH PRESIDENCY

by

KRISTINA E. CURRY

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in the College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University

2007

Copyright by
Kristina E. Curry
2007

CIVIL RELIGION AND PASTORAL POWER
IN THE GEORGE W. BUSH PRESIDENCY

by

KRISTINA E. CURRY

Major Professor: James F. Darsey
Committee: Michael L. Bruner
Mary E. Stuckey

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
May 2007

List of Tables	vi
Chapter I: Pastor Bush and the Fracturing of America	1
Civil Religion, the Rhetorical Contract, and the Promise of Balance	4
George W. Bush Meets Michel Foucault	17
Method	29
Summary	43
Chapter II: The Presidency, Civil Religion, and Pastoral Power	46
Harry S. Truman (1945-1953)	49
Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953-1961)	59
John F. Kennedy (1961-1963)	66
Lyndon B. Johnson (1963-1969)	70
Richard M. Nixon (1969-1974)	80
Gerald R. Ford (1974-1977)	87
James E. Carter, Jr. (1977-1981)	95
Ronald W. Reagan (1981-1989)	102
George H. W. Bush (1989-1993)	112
William J. Clinton (1993-2001)	118
The Sum of the Predecessors	127
Chapter III: President Bush, Civil Religion, and Pastoral Power	130
Bush's Breaches and the Rhetorical Contract	133
President Bush's Brand of New Pastoral Power	163

Pastoral Power and the National Divide	181
Chapter IV: Conclusion	184
The Predecessors' Contractual Legacies	184
George Bush's Faith-Based Legacy	186
Consequences of Bush's Contractual Breach	190
Works Cited	194
Appendix A: Hart's Rhetorical Contract	214
Appendix B: Executive Order 13198	216
Appendix C: Executive Order 13199	221
Appendix D: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative	226
Appendix E: Organizations Mentioned in Sample	230

List of Tables

Table D.1: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative	226
Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample	230

Chapter I: Pastor Bush and the Fracturing of America

During the presidential campaign of 2000, scholars and journalists alike commented on the concept of a divided America, largely along religious lines, which was becoming more pronounced as candidates George W. Bush and Al Gore campaigned across the country.^{1, 2} This apparent divide led Leroy Rouner to assert that “[t]he internal test for American civil religion today is whether it can survive without a common religion as its basis,” particularly given the growing ethnic and religious diversity of the American people (4).³ One of the functions of civil religion is to unify a diverse public. As president, George W. Bush might be expected to apply civil religion in an attempt to heal the divide, but Bush instead embraces evangelical Christianity to exacerbate the divisions in the American public and to elevate religious believers above a secular or fallen class. In a speech he gave to the Southern Baptist Convention in June of 2002. Bush remarked:

¹ In his book God in the White House, Richard Hutcheson provides a brief yet comprehensive review of past presidents’ incorporation of religious dialog into their public address, paying particular attention to Washington, Jefferson, and Madison “because they established the pattern: separation of church and state but close interaction between religion and society. They also established the president’s role in such a society” (Hutcheson 55), and Lincoln who was “the ‘theologian’ of the civil religion” (Hutcheson 55).

² Groups as diverse as Beliefnet, decidedly conservative and religious, and Guardian Unlimited, which is an organization based in the U.K., commented on the 2000 presidential race between George W. Bush and Al Gore. Gary Bauer, writing about the cultural divide, said: “The country perhaps more so than at any time in the past is divided into dramatically opposed camps” (“Message”). While Bauer was writing primarily about the abortion issue, he does address the values of the “traditional side” versus the values of those on “[t]he other side of the cultural divide” (Bauer, “Message”). Bauer views the outcome of the 2000 election, should it swing in favor of the “other,” Democratic side, as perilous for the well-being of the nation. Writing for the Manchester-based Guardian Unlimited, Martin Kettle writes that “the culture wars define the modern United States” and that the candidates Bush and Gore personify “two deeply different alliances of Americans” (Kettle, “Disunited States”). Like Bauer, Kettle also sees the 2000 election as the harbinger of more dissent between the two Americas.

³ See also Beasley, You 3-4; Stuckey, Defining 2.

You and I share common commitments. We believe in fostering a culture of life, and that marriage and family are sacred institutions that should be preserved and strengthened. (Applause.) We believe that a life is a creation, not a commodity, and that our children are gifts to be loved and protected, not products to be designed and manufactured by human cloning. (Applause.)

We believe that protecting human dignity and promoting human rights should be at the center of America's foreign policy. We believe that our government should view the good people who work in faith-based charities as partners, not rivals. We believe that the days of discriminating against religious institutions simply because they are religious must come to an end. (2002k)

In this quotation, Bush addresses a sympathetic audience about the following charged and divisive issues: abortion, gay marriage, stem cell research, human rights, and the role of religion in government. Bush's statement about these issues points to key issues on the minds of the American public. The quotation is a forthright profession of faith, stressing the common bond between Bush and his immediate audience. Each "We believe" suggests a tension, an absent "they," a division in the electorate, and Bush's defiantly unambiguous positions separate the "you and I" from those who hold opposing views. His stance on each of these items, influenced in part by his own religious beliefs, may alienate those who do not share his views.

The U.K.-based publication The Independent featured an editorial entitled "George W. Bush a divider after all." The author suggests that: "The candidate who advertised himself as 'a uniter, not a divider' has failed to narrow any of his country's glaring social and racial divisions"

(Independent, “George W. Bush a divider”).⁴ The president has since been questioned about his status as national divider. In a 2004 interview, Tim Russert asked Bush about that perception.

Bush replied as follows:

Gosh, I don't know because I'm working hard to unite the country. As a matter of fact, it's the hardest part of being the president. I was successful as the governor of Texas for bringing people together for the common good, and I must tell you it's tough here in Washington, and frankly it's the biggest disappointment that I've had so far of coming to Washington.

(NBC's Meet the Press, “Interview with President George W. Bush.”)⁵

President Bush, it appears, realizes that serving as a unifier of the people is an integral role for any American president. Simultaneously, he notes that, under his administration, such unification has not materialized. However sincere President Bush's intent to bring his public together, the fact remains that the country is divided. That division is due, in part, to Bush's embrace of pastoral power rather than civil religion, as evidenced by his rhetoric.

⁴ See also Horowitz, “‘I’m a uniter, not a divider’.”

⁵ During his tenure as governor of Texas, the literature suggests that Bush already had definite opinions about the limited utility of secular government programs in the lives of ordinary Americans. Paul Kengor reports a particular exchange as follows. Bush claimed: “‘We have serious cracks in our culture that no amount of plaster will fix . . . unless we shore up our moral foundation’” (33). Kengor continues, “‘Bush said that government could help with these ills, but only so much’” (33). This sentiment is a likely precursor of what was to become his faith-based agenda as governor, and what has since become his faith-based agenda as president of the United States—an agenda he feels he must deliver “as a matter of politics and principle” (Fineman 30). In fact, Kengor writes that Bush “‘found these faith-based groups superior to the traditional solutions offered by [the] ‘soulless bureaucracy’” (34).

Civil Religion, the Rhetorical Contract, and the Promise of Balance

Robert Bellah's Civil Religion

Robert Bellah's essay "Civil Religion in America" is frequently cited as the genesis of the debate about civil religion in the United States. Writing during the Vietnam war, Bellah was looking for a theory to explain the unification of the American populace in a time of strife. Bellah, a sociologist, believes that it is commonly accepted "that any coherent and viable society rests on a common set of moral understandings about good and bad, right and wrong, in the realm of individual and social action . . . these common moral understandings must also in turn rest upon a common set of religious understandings that provide a picture of the universe in terms of which the moral understandings make sense" (Broken xvi). Bellah looks back to the beginnings of the United States for guidance: "The Pilgrim Fathers had a conception of the covenant and of virtue which we badly need today" (Broken xxii).

Bellah's covenantal language suggests that there is a religious foundation for our bond as a people. Bellah notes there is no Constitutional basis for the separation of church and state ("Religion and Legitimation," 195), and asserts that, whatever else it may mean, the Constitutional clause limiting the establishment of a state religion "certainly does not mean nor has ever meant that the American state has no interest in religion, and it certainly does not mean that religion and politics have nothing to do with each other" ("Religion and Legitimation," 195). Religious principles may be used to guide and legitimize political dealings as well as to foster unity among constituents.

For Bellah, the legitimate basis for the American covenant was not theologically based, sectarian religion; Bellah believes that America's key resource for finding a common identity amidst our diversity is civil religion, which "exists alongside of and [is] rather clearly

differentiated from the churches” (Bellah, “Civil Religion,” 1). In “Civil Religion in America,” he uses the phrase civil religion to mean “a set of beliefs, symbols, and rituals” exercised in the public sphere (Bellah, “Civil Religion,” 4). These beliefs, symbols, and rituals, when successfully implemented, reaffirm America’s moral foundation and the link between the citizenry and the representatives chosen to lead them. The concept of civil religion, writes Bellah, originated with Jean Jacques Rousseau in Rousseau’s 1762 work The Social Contract, wherein Rousseau detailed the common beliefs inherent in that concept (Bellah, “Civil Religion,” 5). According to Gail Gehrig, Rousseau’s conception was that “civil religion would legitimize the political order without establishing a competing religious authority” and it “would perform the social functions of insuring [sic] political legitimacy and social cohesion” (Assessment 6). Bellah’s article draws on Rousseau’s ideas and is still cited by scholars who analyze the function of civil religion in the modern presidency.⁶

This civil religion finds expression in the president’s various addresses to the nation. In essence, claims Bellah, the legendary wall between church and state has not precluded the incorporation of religious imagery into political address (“Civil Religion,” 3). In fact, the American populace as a whole *wants* and in some cases rather *expects* religious language in presidential rhetoric.⁷ That is, presidential and religious discourse are undeniably linked, and therefore are extremely important to Americans, particularly Americans of faith (Pierard and Linder 19, qtd. in Gunn 13).

⁶ For example, Beasley (in “The Rhetoric of Ideological Consensus in the United States: American Principles and American Pose in Presidential Inaugurals”), Daughton, Gunn, Hart, Novak, and Pierard and Linder (to mention only a few scholars) all look to Bellah as a starting point. Cristi even criticizes Bellah for not thoroughly investigating Rousseau’s true meaning and intent behind the concept of civil religion or civil piety.

⁷ See also Davis 233; Duin; Gustafson 709, 721; Linder 2; Pierard and Linder 296.

Civil Religion Sampler

While there were other ideas about civil religion advanced by scholars, often in reaction to Bellah's "Civil Religion in America," "the publication of Bellah's essay at the height of national soul-searching during the Vietnam War occasioned Bellah's place as a major interpreter of American religion in the second half of the twentieth century" (Wimberly and Swatos 1). Gehrig writes that there are actually five types of civil religion. Bellah's version of civil religion may be characterized as transcendental universal religion, which provides "a set of transcendent ideals by which the society is both integrated and judged" (Gehrig, Assessment 2). This 'type' of civil religion has been the most extensively used and evaluated of the civil religion models (Gehrig, Assessment 3).

Since Bellah wrote his essay, scholars have revisited it in an attempt to clarify the concept of civil religion. In fact, Gehrig asserts that: "Much of the confusion and debate surrounding the concept of American civil religion has developed from conflicting definitions of what it is" (Debate, 52).⁸ Despite this problem of definition, a survey of works written by communication scholars, sociologists, and political scientists does reveal considerable agreement on four fundamental, recurrent characteristics of civil religion: its abundant symbolism, its transcendent beliefs, its uniqueness, and its capacity to unify the American public.⁹

⁸ See also Coleman, "Civil Religion," 68.

⁹ Works surveyed to identify common characteristics of civil religion include Robert Benne's "The Persistence of Civil Religion," John Coleman's "Civil Religion," Gail Gehrig's American Civil Religion: An Assessment and "The American Civil Religion Debate: A Source for Theory Construction," Robert Linder's "Universal Pastor: President Bill Clinton's Civil Religion," Michael Thomas and Charles Flippen's "American Civil Religion: An Empirical Study," Ronald Wimberly's "Civil Religion and the Choice for President: Nixon in '72," and Ronald Wimberly and William Swatos' "Civil Religion."

In the context of civil religion, symbolism usually manifests itself in references to certain Founders, key words and phrases (<ideographs>), and ceremonial events. Richard Pierard believes that the most concise definition of civil religion has been provided by the Lutheran World Federation Department for Theology and Studies, as follows: “[c]ivil religion consists of a pattern of symbols, ideas, and practices that legitimate the authority of civil institutions in a society” (Pierard, “Civil”). Symbols figure prominently in this definition. John Coleman claims that a unique part of civil religion’s symbolism is its identification of “the civil saints” such as Washington (75), and “civil sermons” best represented by the presidential inaugural address (75). Presidents frequently mention their predecessors, particularly the great presidents such as Lincoln, to add legitimacy to their proposals. Ceremonial events, such as inaugurations, provide an optimum venue or event for expressions of civil religion, particularly given the covenant established between the president and the people at such an occasion.

Transcendent civil religion “assumes a system of national ideals which [sic] exist as social facts apart from the extent of their acceptance by the American populace at any point in time” and also assumes “all of the functions attributed to traditional religious systems” (Gehrig, Assessment 12). Transcendence means that civil religion is acceptable to most people precisely because it appeals to higher values and is not denominationally specific. Transcendence relies on “common moral understandings rooted in religious meaning structures” such as “liberty, justice, charity, and personal virtue” (Gehrig, Assessment 13). Robert Benne writes that:

American civil religion is the common denominator religion of a religious country with the First Amendment. When there is no established church or religion, and yet there is a great deal of religious vitality in the country, civil religion is an inevitable result. A religious people want a transcendent

dimension to the great moments of national life and civil religion is the vehicle for that. (178)

The transcendent aspect of civil religion means that there is a shared set of goals beyond the proverbial here and now that guides the public.

Civil religion's uniqueness is demonstrated in that it may be clearly differentiated from the beliefs and ideals of the arenas in which it operates: religious and government organizations. John Coleman writes that "[c]ivil religion is a special case of the religious symbol system, designed to perform a differentiated function which is the unique province of neither church nor state" (69). He suggests that the American brand of civil religion is "uniquely differentiated" (Coleman 69). In this case, differentiation means autonomous and independent. That is, civil religion is separate from both church and state affairs. Civil religion "is structurally and functionally differentiated" from church and state (Gehrig, "Debate," 55).

Bellah noted the unique and separate nature of civil religion as well: "Bellah's conceptual argument [is] that civil religion is a distinct cultural component within American society that is not captured either by American politics or by denominational religiosity" (Wimberly and Swatos 2). This is important because it establishes civil religion as a distinct entity that is integrated with both religious and political tenets.

A common set of transcendent beliefs held by the public at large provides direction and unification for the American public. Thomas and Flippen say that the functions of civil religion are "first, to provide a transcendent goal and a meaning system for the political process and, second, to motivate citizens for the achievement of national political goals" (219). In a similar interpretation, Ronald Wimberly and William Swatos say that Bellah's "civil religiosity is posited to be a common, if not socially integrative, set of beliefs in transcendent principles and reality

against which the historical experience and actions of the nation should be evaluated” (1).¹⁰ Thomas and Flippen describe civil religion as “a mechanism for *societal integration* and maintenance of the institutions of the state” (218, emphasis added), while Max Stackhouse characterizes it as “a projection by a civic order of its experiences and values onto the cosmic order *for the sake of social solidarity*” (291, emphasis added). Key to this evaluation is the notion of cohesion—that civil religion serves to unite the American people, particularly as it is rhetorically exercised by the president.

Robert Linder also comments on the unifying potential of civil religion, saying that it may be defined as: “a collection of beliefs, values, ceremonies, and symbols that gives sacred meaning to the political life of the community, provides the nation *with an overarching sense of unity* that transcends all internal conflicts and differences, and relates the society to the realm of ultimate meaning” (1). Note in this quotation the concepts of unity and transcendence. Only a public unified by goals and ideals founded on a general sense of moral rightness can face the challenges of a modern society.

John Coleman’s analysis of civil religion provides a neat summary of the four characteristics surveyed here. Gail Gehrig characterizes Coleman’s argument as four propositions:

Proposition I: American civil religion is the religious symbol system which relates the citizen’s role and American society’s place in space, time, and history to the conditions of ultimate existence and meaning.

Proposition II: American civil religion is structurally differentiated from both the political community and the religious community.

¹⁰ See also Shepherd “Robert Bellah’s Sociology of Religion,” 400.

Proposition III: American civil religion performs specialized religious functions performed neither by church nor state.

Proposition IV: The differentiation of American civil religion from political and religious communities follows the general direction of cultural evolution. (“Debate,” 52)

This definition agrees with that provided by Bellah given the emphasis on symbolic importance and transcendent meaning. Moreover, this definition makes note of how civil religion is a distinct entity: separate from both church and state, yet capable of influencing both. Coleman writes: “By definition, civil religion is a religious system given to the social integration of society” by providing for “national identity and solidarity” despite the differences of the people (76).

National Unity, Identity, and the President Priest

A key function of civil religion, unification of the people, is enabled by the national spokesperson for the civil religion, the president. Ronald Wimberly writes that “the presidency is an integral part of American civil religion (45) and the presidency is “a prime social structure in which the phenomenon [of civil religion] is readily observable” (46). The president is the leader of “public faith” (Linder 1). At the same time, the president is expected to maintain a clear division between church and state. Derek Davis explains that “while a president can be expected to be religious, and occasionally even rely upon his faith in performing his office, he must still respect the fundamental American commitment to church-state separation” (233). The president should use the civil religion to bind together an ideologically diverse public, while still maintaining the separation of powers. The key is maintaining the balance between the sacred and secular language.

If it is true that President Bush has upset the balance between secular and sacred concerns in his administration, then that has implications for the coherence of the electorate. An imbalance would be problematic given the fact that the president has traditionally been seen as a uniter of the people—the prime figure in establishing the collective national identity. Michael McGee writes that a leader creates “the people,” and, in turn, ““the people’ focus on the Leader to establish a group identity” (“In Search,” 241). McGee further asserts that “most all of social theory has been warranted by understanding ‘humanity’ to be a collective entity, ‘the people’” (“In Search,” 236). Just as he has the capacity to unify with his rhetorical execution of civil religion, so also does the president have the capability to divide the public if his implementation of the civil religion does not respect the disparate views and beliefs held by the public. That is, “Wherever there is religious pluralism, a civil religion based on one highly specific world religion is bound to fail to provide integrating national symbols for the whole population in the land” (Coleman 71). An analysis of President Bush’s speeches reveals that Bush has violated the tenets of civil religion in general and the rhetorical contract in particular by promoting a single, sectarian faith as *the* faith that should serve to undergird the nation’s laws and collective behavior.

Unification between an American president and the American people may be most evident in the inaugural address delivered by each incoming president. The presidential inaugural address is particularly useful as a tool to unify the American people, say Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (15). Specifically, the inaugural, in the aftermath of a divisive election battle, “unifies the audience by reconstituting its members as the people, who can witness and ratify the ceremony” (Campbell and Jamieson 15). Thus, from the start, an incoming president’s role is that of a unifier of the people under a new administration—potentially an administration with radically different goals than the one that preceded it. Campbell and Jamieson further assert

that a president's inaugural address is "an essential element in a ritual transition in which the covenant between the citizenry and their leaders is renewed" (14). Note the term "covenant." This term is important because it adds a religious dimension to the relationship between the president and the people he symbolically represents. The fact that this covenant is both established and enacted with the inaugural address of an incoming president indissolubly links the president with the people in a sacred bond. Vanessa Beasley analyzes inaugural addresses to show that "presidents have not only urged the American people to think of themselves as sharing certain ideals, but also as sharing a particular attitudinal dispositions" ("Rhetoric," 169). Sharing core beliefs is critical to successful unification.

Civil religion is a vehicle whereby the president may foster that solidarity. The principles of civil religion, exercised correctly, are examples of how presidents foster unity and "identity in terms of certain constitutive principles" (Beasley, "Rhetoric," 170). Ideological unification is key, and civil religion provides a broad and encompassing ideology for the public to espouse. Quoting Rogers Smith, Beasley writes that political leaders need the public to consider themselves a people in order to execute their official duties and give credence to their decisions ("Rhetoric," 174). There is difficulty in that the people are decidedly diverse, which in turn fosters the need to create some sort of unifying idea—civil religion ("Rhetoric," 174). Civil religious ideas and the rhetorical execution thereof by the president "affirm idealized cultural norms" (Beasley, "Rhetoric," 175). Furthermore, "presidential discourse teaches American culture to its listeners, consistently reminding them how they *ought* to know or believe" (Beasley, "Rhetoric," 175). Beasley asserts that unification is achieved, in part, because "presidents routinely describe American ideals in terms of civil religious themes" ("Rhetoric," 175). Part of the unification process also includes the establishment of an American identity.

In Defining Americans: The Presidency and National Identity, Mary Stuckey writes that American presidents “articulate national identity” and that “enough of us must recognize ourselves in presidential formulations of national identity to legitimate and sustain the process of national leadership” (2). The president, to the extent he is able, strives to include the ever-disparate American public in one collective group. Stuckey further points to “how the differing elements of discourse and constitutive claims come together to forge our national identities,” and that identities necessarily change as history progresses (Defining 3). This is important because of the discursive element: through language, the president creates community and unifies the American populace. “Rather than merely speaking to the people,” writes Stuckey, American presidents “claim to become something of a surrogate of ‘the people,’ simultaneously enacting and enunciating our national values and national identity” (Defining 8). The president unifies and defines us, as Americans, through his rhetoric. Such unification is critical to the health of a nation composed of people with varying ethnic backgrounds, lifestyles, and beliefs.

In You, the People, Beasley looks at “how U.S. presidents have used language to try to develop and maintain feelings of shared national identity within a wildly diverse democracy” (You 3-4). She points to times of crisis, such as the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, as instances when the American people need “a message of reassurance, resolve, and unity that only a president of the United States could provide” (Beasley, You 4; Hart, Pulpit 47), while also acknowledging that a president must foster accord in times of peace, as well. Like Stuckey, Beasley evaluates presidential address to explore the “rhetorical construction of ‘the people’” (You 9). She acknowledges that such a unification is critical to a president’s being able to enact policy on a national scale (Beasley, You 10). While the president does use occasion-specific address to foster a sense of cohesion among the American public, historically he has incorporated

civil religion as a prime and reliable means of fostering a united republic. Key to the concept of civil religion is that the equilibrium between political and religious interests be maintained.

Roderick Hart's Rhetorical Departure

The balance between religious and political power, writes Roderick Hart, has been maintained through a rhetorical contract between organized religion and government. In his 1977 work The Political Pulpit, Hart begins with the idea of civil religion, informed by the ideas of Kenneth Burke, as “a system of symbolic, dramatic action” that fulfills the emotional needs of the nation (Hart, Pulpit 2). Hart claims that religious overtones are commonplace, even necessary, in presidential address, but warns that even seemingly innocuous religious rhetoric risks upsetting the tenuous balance in the American polis between transcendent unification and religious pluralism. Hart cites Pfeffer on this expansive tendency of religious rhetoric:

Government proclamations of days of thanksgiving and occasionally prayer are another illustration of ceremonial acts of government which are of slight intrinsic significance but are of great importance in the use to which they are put as precedents to justify far more substantial encroachments of government on religious affairs or religion on government affairs. (Pulpit 13)

That is, while religious expression is commonplace in presidential rhetoric, there is also the real possibility that such language can justify intrusive policy.

It is the language component of civil religion in particular that Hart specifies as his departure point from other approaches to the study of civil religion. Hart writes that “[m]ost commentators have discussed only the macro-sociological or macro-theological dimensions of civil religion, thus allowing the *specific verbal details of civic piety* to go unexamined” (Pulpit 3,

emphasis added). These linguistic traits, Hart asserts, may be understood using the concept of the rhetorical contract (Pulpit 45).

Hart asserts that the two key elements of the contract are “its rhetoricalness and its flexibility” (Pulpit 48). The emphasis upon the rhetorical element is in accordance with Hart’s insistence on focusing upon the verbal aspect of civil religion. Flexibility is important as, he affirms, each incoming president has to revisit the contract (Hart, Pulpit 44). That is, the “sacred-secular line is a matter of constant renegotiation” (Lee 7), and that line has been negotiated to the point of breakage with the Bush presidency. As a rhetorical instrument, the contract is pliable, and can be tweaked in accordance with whatever exigency presents itself (Hart, Pulpit 51). Part of my analysis of President Bush’s execution of civil religion in his addresses is this flexibility Hart describes: “the intensity with which America’s national faith is preached, and hence the extent to which the terms of the contract are rigidly enforced, are quite variable indeed” (Pulpit 51). Even given the flexibility of the contract, it can still be broken. This is important because an acknowledged adaptability in the scope of presidential application of civil religion means that a violation of that limit must be egregious to affirm its place outside the tradition.

Recently, scholars have revisited Hart’s contract to see if it is still viable. In 2002, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the publication of The Political Pulpit, a group of scholars collaborated to discern the state of civil religion in America—to determine whether or not Hart’s rhetorical contract was still a realistic means of analyzing the interaction between American government, organized religion, and the populace in the twenty-first century (J. Pauley 3). The results were published in both the March 2002 edition of the The Journal of Communication and Religion, and subsequently in a book entitled The Political Pulpit Revisited, published in 2004. The decision by a group of scholars of religious rhetoric to revisit Hart’s work is significant

because it points to the ongoing importance of civil religion in scholarship regarding the American presidency. Furthermore, the fact that the contract was found, in 2002, to be still relevant and largely accurate is critical. Bush's breaking of an invalid contract would not be worthy of analysis. Contributors to the study offer various arguments about the relevance and efficacy of Hart's rhetorical contract.¹¹ For example, Robert Friedenbergr says that Hart's original concept of the contract "continue[s] to accurately describe the relationship between organized religion and government" (34). Much of his analysis focuses on the agreement that government's language will not have an overly religious tone. This is characteristic of the balance central to Hart's contract. Friedenbergr asserts that the status of the relationship between government and organized religion will likely remain unchanged in the foreseeable future—an endorsement of Hart's original proposal. Another contributor, Nneka Ofulue, states that the balance between church and state is a component of the Founders' legacy—a relationship that "permitted no legal entanglement between Church and State," but nonetheless allows "symbolic connections between the religious and political dimensions of American culture" (50). These connections are maintained through *rhetorical devices* that reaffirm the religious component of the institution of the presidency (50, emphasis added).

Hart's response to the essays collected for the March 2002 edition of The Journal of Communication and Religion is entitled "God, Country, and a World of Words." Hart states that his original argument was that "a unique 'rhetorical contract' between church and state has been

¹¹ Not all of the contributors focus on the Hart's rhetorical contract specifically. Ronald Lee believes the focus should be on traditional religion, specifically "transcendent religion in American politics" (6). To support his belief, Lee points to the historical relationship between government and the Judeo-Christian tradition, and faults Hart for not realizing that "[t]he transcendent element of religion, the genuine appeal to the sacred, has a greater influence on contemporary politics than Hart recognizes" (8). The influence of denominational religion has faltered before the state precepts of nationalism and patriotism, according to Carolyn Marvin. That is, there is no longer an equilibrium, and all authority now rests with secular government.

created in the U.S. and that the contract has functioned well to minimize politico-religious tensions since the Founding” to keep the two entities in a comfortable stasis (“God,” 136). In this essay, Hart seeks to know whether or not the contract is still a valid model to use in analyzing church and state relations in twenty-first century America. In his estimation, the contract he proposed in 1977 is still very much in use, and the terms therein are largely adhered to by those who want to secure their place in the political arena (“God,” 137). Hart does concede, however, that the “rhetoric of civil religion may have changed a bit” since he originally wrote The Political Pulpit (“God,” 138). Hart then proceeds to address each of the previous authors’ arguments, one-by-one, with an emphasis on the following questions: “(1) Is the contractual model of church-state relations conceptually convincing? (2) Is the contractual model of church-state relations empirically accurate? and (3) Is the contractual model of church-state relations normatively justified?” (“God,” 136). Hart answers those questions “yes, yes, and yes” (“God,” 136). Having willingly submitted to such a dissection of his twenty-five year old work, Hart thoughtfully responds to each of the scholars and still finds his argument sound: there still exists a delicate balance between political and religious forces in the nation’s government.

George W. Bush Meets Michel Foucault

It appears that President Bush may have transgressed the limits of civil religion, which serves as a unifier of the American people, forsaking civil religion for theological religion and highlighting one kind of faith in particular, Christianity. Nancy Gibbs identifies “[t]he original promise to empower faith-based social-service groups, a core piece of Bush’s domestic policy” (30), as an example of how religious ideals have been incorporated into the country’s system of government, thus worsening the cultural divide. The Bush administration has acknowledged this divide and has scaled back the approach sent to Congress. This action was a bid to “salvage one of

President Bush’s top domestic priorities” (Peterson A35; see also Lakley). In fact, the institution of the presidency under Bush has been described as the “faith-based presidency” (Gibbs 26). How does such a devout presidency reconcile with the long-standing tradition of civil religion?

The most prominent example of Bush’s contribution to the widening divide in America may be his establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. The creation of this office was, in fact, his second executive order as president, preceded only by the executive order that mandated Cabinet coordination with the Office. Executive Order 13199 is dated 29 January 2001, just days after Bush assumed the presidency. The order reads, in part, as follows:

There is established a White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (White House OFBCI) within the Executive Office of the President that will have lead responsibility in the executive branch to establish policies, priorities, and objectives for the Federal Government’s comprehensive effort to enlist, equip, enable, empower and expand the work of faith-based and other community organizations to the extent permitted by law. (Bush, 2001b, 1)¹²

Given the textual content of this order, wherein government and faith-based groups are undeniably bound together with the end goal of expanding the influence and reach of sacred influence in traditionally secular affairs, President Bush broke one of the central rules of Hart’s contract: that government and organized religion must not reveal the extent of their cooperation to the American public. Kathryn Tenpas and Stephen Hess point to the establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives as an example of the balance in crisis:

¹² For the complete text of Bush’s Executive Order establishing the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, please refer to “Appendix C: Executive Order 13199” on page 221.

the newly established White House OFBCI attracted controversy from day one when Republicans and Democrats alike began to question the constitutionality of financially assisting religious institutions that provide government services. The mission of this office not only created opposition within both parties but created enemies and allies within the religious community—the very group that supposedly had the most to gain from such an office. (584)

Bellah commented on such balance regarding republican and liberal concepts, saying that “from the beginning the balance has never been easy or even” (“Religion and Legitimation,” 196). The implementation of President Bush’s faith-based initiative by executive order both upset the balance of sacred/secular power and further divided the country.

Since the implementation of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, there has been much commentary on the federal distribution of funds and the practices of the primarily conservative Christian organizations receiving the funds (Kaplan 52). Thomas Edsall reports, “Under the auspices of its religion-based initiatives and other federal programs, the administration has funneled at least \$157 million in grants to organizations run by political and ideological allies” such as Heritage Community Services, an influential organization promoting abstinence education (A01). Operation Blessing, which is a conservative Christian program run by televangelist Pat Robertson, has received 23.5 million because of Bush’s faith-based plan (Edsall A01). Esther Kaplan explains that not only high-profile people and organizations have received money because of the faith-based initiative, but that “dozens of grants have gone to support the less familiar grass roots infrastructure of the religious right” (52). This suggests that a group need not be high-profile to receive funds, just Christian.¹³ The routine distribution of funds to

organizations headed by Bush supporters may be questionable, but the real issue is the religiosity of the groups receiving funds and how that religiosity is translated into the programs they offer to the community. This is particularly the case as, Bush says: “When we have federal monies, people should be allowed to access that money without having to lose their mission or change their mission” (2002 h). Should a group’s mission include ministering in the hopes of conversion of souls, therein lies a problem.

President Bush’s Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives exacerbates an already apparent divide as people report on the fact that “fundamentalist-oriented groups are getting the lion’s share of tax aid under Bush’s initiative” (Boston, “Church-State,” 10). Writing for USA Today, Jill Lawrence says that civil liberty groups find Bush’s faith-based initiative “threatening” and that it is “an assault on the constitutional wall between church and state” (“Bush’s agenda”). The ACLU also expresses concern, namely that the faith-based initiative has “entangled government with religious institutions across the country” (ACLU, “House Passes Bush Initiative”). The introduction of sectarian religion into the affairs of the national government is a symptom of Bush’s violation of the rhetorical contract between himself, as the representative of government, and organized religion.

This shift to emphasize religious precepts in government affairs threatens the unification of the country, disturbs the balance of, and topples the wall of separation between church and state. Thus, this office is both symptomatic of the cultural divide and serves to worsen the divide. Furthermore, the actions of those running the office, such as the dubious allocation of funds, breaches the rhetorical contract made between the president, organized religion, and the people

¹³ Michael Kranish of The Boston Globe reports that 98.3 percent of the faith-based funds designated for foreign aid have gone to Christian organizations (“Democrats inspect”).

the president represents, thus disrupting the necessary balance between church and state affairs, sacred and secular language.

It appears that President Bush has upset the historical balance of power between government and organized religion in his administration of the country, with divisive results. This is primarily apparent in his rhetoric regarding the faith-based initiative. Bush's speeches on the initiative reveal elements of pastoral power that challenge standard American civil religion. In place of the traditional concepts of civil religion, George W. Bush, I will argue, has substituted a unique form of pastoral power. Whereas the goal of civil religion is to *unify* the public by transcendent, nondenominational means, the goal of pastoral power is to *control* the public—in President Bush's case by religious appeals and strategies. In this study of civil religion and pastoral power, the president is the key figure in rhetorically executing the strategy. The following section describes the origins of pastoral power in more detail.

Pastoral Power

The concept of pastoral power has been evolving at least since Plato wrote Statesman in 360 B.C.E., though Plato did not use the term “pastoral power.” Michel Foucault cites Plato extensively to advance Foucault's own theory of pastoral power. In Statesman, Plato attempts to delineate the way in which the statesman rules, as well as to establish the authority of the statesman or king as a shepherd of humans. The human statesman-shepherd does indeed look after his herd of people (Plato 199), the key to which is the “care of the whole human community together” (Plato 79 [276 b7]). In the final analysis, the king/statesman possesses a certain expertise for herding the people, regardless of the people's disparity:

this is the single and complete task of kingly weaving-together, never to allow moderate dispositions to stand away from the courageous, but by

working them closely into each other as if with a [weaving] shuttle, through sharing of opinions, through honours, dishonour, esteem, and the giving of pledges to one another, drawing together a smooth and 'fine-woven' fabric out of them, as the expression is, always to entrust offices in cities to those in common. (Plato 173 [310 e8 - 311 a1])

Thus, the king/statesman is responsible for bridging divides, finding commonalities, and caring for each individual in the flock with the ultimate aim of preserving the flock as a single entity, much like the charter of the modern-day American president. While this sounds remarkably like the secular aim of the president to unify the public through execution of civil religion via the rhetorical contract, the difference is that pastoral power goes further than mere unification. Instead, the goal is to unify using "individualizing power" as a means of controlling the public "in a continuous and permanent way" (Foucault, "Pastoral," 136).

Foucault examines Plato's Statesman as a means to understand contemporary pastoral power as executed by a secular government official. Foucault suggests that the conception of man as a shepherd of men was probably controversial in Plato's time (Foucault, "Pastoral," 140). The most important factor in structuring this role is not the kind of flock the shepherd tends, writes Foucault, but rather how the shepherd acts, what the shepherd does ("Pastoral," 140). Foucault explains that the issue of tending to a flock may be problematic in that the political shepherd does not actively care for a flock, evaluating each person individually. Instead, the shepherd concentrates on binding: "binding different virtues; binding contrary temperaments" (Foucault, "Pastoral," 141). This is very similar to the role the president plays in developing constitutive civil religious rhetoric to unify his audience. Foucault studies this, he explains, because the notion of shepherding humans and the power that activity entails are "still highly important for

contemporary society. They deal with the relations between political power at work within the state as a legal framework of unity, and a power we can call ‘pastoral,’ whose role is to constantly ensure, sustain, and improve the lives of each and every one” (Foucault, “Pastoral,” 141). Based on what he found in Plato’s work, Foucault lists each element of both old, traditional pastoral power—when it was truly central to church officials and their teachings—and a modern, or new pastoral power—as it is evidenced in secular institutions.

In Foucault’s work on pastoral power, his argument is that it has morphed from a church strategy to a state strategy. As a state strategy, pastoral power is knowingly used by politicians in the act of governing the populace:

since the sixteenth century, a new political form of power has been continuously developing. This new political structure . . . is the state. But most of the time, the state is envisioned as a kind of political power which ignores individuals, looking only at the interests of the totality or, I should say, of a class or group among the citizens . . . the state’s power . . . is both an individualizing and a totalizing form of power. (Foucault, “Subject,” 213)

That the state has assumed some degree of power over its subjects is not a new revelation. What is new in the context of my analysis is the degree to which religious groups are partnered with the state in exercising power over the polis. In effect, President Bush is melding old and new pastoral power, infusing new pastoral power with the definitive religious component of old. Not only does such cooperation threaten the church/state divide, it also divides the country into secular and sacred camps. As society has developed since Plato’s writing of Statesman, there have been necessary changes in government interaction in public life.

Foucault's most comprehensive explanation of traditional, church-based pastoral power, what I call "old" pastoral power, appears in "The Subject and Power," as follows:

- 1) It is a form of power whose ultimate aim is to assure individual salvation in the next world.
- 2) Pastoral power is not merely a form of power which commands; it must also be prepared to sacrifice itself for the life and salvation of the flock. Therefore, it is different from royal power, which demands a sacrifice from its subjects to save the throne.
- 3) It is a form of power which does not look after just the whole community, but each individual in particular, during his entire life.
- 4) Finally, this form of power cannot be exercised without knowing the inside of people's minds, without exploring their souls, without making them reveal their innermost secrets. It implies a knowledge of the conscience and an ability to direct it.

This form of power is salvation oriented . . . It is oblation . . . it is individualizing . . . it is linked with the production of truth—the truth of the individual himself. (Foucault, "Subject," 214)

As a church method, old pastoral power is commonplace if it is not completely acceptable to all the faithful. The shift to the "new" pastoral power as a tool of government is important because, in the case of President Bush, it effectively distributes religious ideas and ideals throughout society as the number of organizations embracing pastoral power increases. Conversely, a traditional political application of new pastoral power would not incorporate religious organizations. By adding the religious and "salvation oriented" character of old pastoral power to his execution of

the new, Bush has formed a unique implementation of pastoral power. Instead of unifying a diverse public, as does civil religion, Bush's pastoral power assumes a homogenous society of believers, which is certainly not the case in twenty-first century America. Bush's using his special method of new pastoral power, given the increasing diversity of Americans, is problematic. His is a false unity—the unification only of fellow believers in Christian holy writ. Furthermore, that unity is federally funded.

Foucault claims that the state has taken the power exercised by the Christian church and has subsumed the *governing techniques* of the church into its own application (“Subject,” 213, emphasis added). This suggests that Foucault's new pastoral power is decidedly focused on process and control, not ideology. This is significant because as Bush and other practitioners of what should be, ostensibly, new pastoral power use its Christian foundation to justify policy decisions and resultant actions, the citizens may perceive an imbalance in traditional government activity. That is, by wedding sacred belief with secular activity, the former and formal relationship between the two is disrupted. Old pastoral power informs new with religious overtones that were likely not intended. The result is Bush's hybridized form of pastoral power.

The state, writes Foucault, is “a modern matrix of individualization, or a new form of pastoral power” (“Subject,” 215). In this case, the new pastoral power has three key aims:

- 1) [. . . pastoral power] was no longer a question of leading people to their salvation in the next world, but rather ensuring salvation in this world. And in this context, the word *salvation* takes on different meanings: health, well-being (that is, sufficient wealth, standard of living), security, protection against accidents. A series of “worldly” aims

2) Concurrently, the officials of pastoral power increased. Sometimes this form of power was exerted by state apparatus Sometimes the power was exercised by *private ventures, welfare societies, benefactors and generally by philanthropists* [emphasis added]. . . .

3) Finally, the multiplication of the aims and agents of pastoral power focused the development of knowledge of man around two roles: one, globalizing and quantitative, concerning the population; the other, analytical, concerning the individual. (Foucault, "Subject," 215)

Foucault claims that the state has taken the power exercised by the Christian church and has subsumed that technique into its own application ("Subject," 213). The state, writes Foucault, is "a modern matrix of individualization, or a new form of pastoral power" ("Subject," 215). Note in item two the list provided by Foucault of the kinds of groups that will administer the new pastoral power: "private ventures, welfare societies, benefactors and generally [. . .] philanthropists" ("Subject," 215). What is missing from this list is mention of religious organizations. While new pastoral power is rooted in old pastoral power's focus on Christianity, there is no mention of Christian organizations in the application of the new power. In President Bush's application of the new, however, religious organizations are absolutely indispensable. Thus, Bush melds old and new formations of pastoral power in his unique execution of the phenomenon—with divisive consequences for his constituency.

The Relevance of Pastoral Power

Unlike Bellah's civil religion, Bush's new pastoral power, which reaffirms its foundations in Christian teleology, is decidedly religious. Furthermore, whereas civil religion calls for cooperation between government, organized religion, and the polis, Bush's pastoral power may

be used to become involved in the public's life as a guiding and transcendent force, much as an individual's religion. Bush's application of pastoral power is characterized by its use of a Christian foundation and world-view in an attempt to justify policy and attendant activities. He is thus infusing the new pastoral power with traits of the old pastoral power detailed by Foucault by fervently incorporating religion. As a result, the citizens perceive tension and imbalance in traditionally accepted government activities—the result of which is an increasing cultural divide between sacred and secular.

In Foucault's writings about the role of government officials in the activities of society, he pays particular attention to the balance or imbalance of power. As Hart's rhetorical contract between the federal government and organized religion uses the citizenry as witness to the contract, their status as a third party is important. That is, the public will be directly affected by the cooperation (both overt and covert) of church and government. Bush's new pastoral power innately resonates with individuals of faith. Using religious tenets to control a populace largely familiar with and comfortable with religious beliefs serves as a successful strategy for implementing governmental policies.

Foucault's theories of old and new pastoral power may be used to interrogate Bush's rhetoric precisely because of the religious foundation of that rhetoric. The president has some power to set up programs, such as those directed through the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and these programs may be used as a means of controlling or leading the public in a certain direction. Pastoral power acknowledges the link between politics and religion, while also noting the potential for corruption and control. By understanding Bush's new pastoral power and identifying rhetorical instances of Bush's unique application of the concept in his rhetoric, it becomes possible to determine the degree to which Bush has veered away from

traditional notions of civil religion. Active involvement of religious groups in the ministering of the nation—groups multiplied per item two of new pastoral power—not only breaches Hart’s contract, it also points to the possibility for more religious influence in the public sphere in the future. This is important as such influence threatens the delicate balance, rhetorical and actual, between sacred and secular in individual and, by extension, national affairs.

I will argue that President George W. Bush has altered the balance of power in church/state relations by breaching the rhetorical contract and supplementing civil religion with his own conception of pastoral power, thereby changing civil religion from a generic concept used to unite the people to an overtly religious and Christian ideology that cannot serve to unify a diverse American populace. In fact, Bush’s religious rhetoric and policy have further divided an already split American constituency. His actions, to the extent they are successfully manifested in policy decisions and his rhetoric, may have long-term consequences for both the office of the presidency and for the country as a whole. Bush’s acts may alter the nation’s civil religion for future presidents by establishing the standard that the leader of the people must have a strong faith in order to execute the duties of the presidential office. To the degree President Bush is successful, his actions have implications for civil religion itself. That is, he may fundamentally alter the concept—placing more emphasis on the religious facet as a means of governmental guidance and policy for the American public as a whole. Future presidents might challenge such a concept with varying degrees of success. Given that religion is so important both to President Bush personally and in his rhetorical execution of civil religion, the concept of his brand of new pastoral power may provide a possible means of explanation for his particular rhetorical execution of civil religion. Thus, much as President Bush has some leeway in interpreting civil religion, he has also exercised leeway in implementing new pastoral power by making it resonate with religion.

Method

Choice of Texts

The data I plan to use for this project are President George W. Bush's first term addresses regarding his faith-based initiative. This sample provides a convenient locus for evaluating Bush's rhetorical execution of Hart's contract as well as examples of the implementation of his *new new* pastoral power. Instances of both affirm my position that Bush has violated traditional civil religion by replacing it with his own new pastoral power.

I have selected speeches dealing specifically with the faith-based agenda because I believe that *that* particular policy is the primary indicator of how President Bush has replaced standard civil religion with pastoral power. That is, a key element in Foucault's notion of new pastoral power is that it increases the number of agents of said power. Given Bush's decidedly sacred implementation, this defies Hart's contract by overtly coupling religious institutions and government institutions, specifically the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives created by executive order. The increasing influence of these non-government and predominantly Christian groups, and the Cabinet officials instated to deal with the groups, reveals their atypical partnership.

I select speeches from President Bush's first term because it provides a compact time frame for analysis. Furthermore, because the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives was created by President Bush, without Congressional approval, during his first term, he was more involved with the program than he has been thus far in his second term. Moreover, before the war in Iraq began in March of 2003, Bush had more time to devote to the social ills of America that he believed could be healed with implementation of the initiative. These facts suggest that the speeches Bush delivered during his first term are likely to be the best examples of

his beliefs and plans for the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and therefore representative of his overall philosophy.

My sample is derived from an archived and comprehensive list of documents identified by the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. As the official office of Bush's plan, their collection of documents is presumably the most complete and representative of Bush's pure ideology regarding his faith-based plan.¹⁴ Forty-one of the listed speeches were delivered during his first term, and those compose my sample for this analysis. For a complete list of these addresses, please refer to Appendix D: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative on page 226. Given my argument that Bush has violated traditional civil religion with the implementation of his unique religion-infused new pastoral power by means of breaking the rhetorical contract, I plan to analyze those addresses for consistent themes of both contractual deviance and pastoral power.

To guide me in my handling of the texts, I look to scholars who have conducted similar analyses of a large number of texts. Thematic analysis is an appropriate approach for my project, and it has demonstrated utility in the analysis of relatively large bodies of discourse. For example, in her work "Anecdotes and Conversations: The Narrational and Dialogic Styles of Modern Presidential Communication," Mary Stuckey surveys a series of texts to identify themes unique to presidential rhetors. In his analysis of Jimmy Carter's rhetoric, Keith Erickson also uses many texts, 136 to be exact (223), to identify the themes in Carter's rhetoric of "private and civic piety" (221). Similarly, Vanessa Beasley selects presidential inaugurals and State of the Union

¹⁴ Remember, the first executive order President Bush signed in office, Executive Order 13198, established "Executive Department Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives" in Bush's Cabinet. Thus, before even creating the Office of Faith-Based Initiatives itself, Bush assured its survival through. See Appendix B: Executive Order 13198 on page 216 for the full text of that Executive Order.

addresses, which she calls “highly ritualized instances of presidential speech [that] can be expected to affirm idealized cultural norms” (You 9), and then identifies common themes in those texts. These examples demonstrate that my identification and analysis of themes is an appropriate way to examine Bush’s rhetoric.

Hart’s four key elements of the rhetorical civil religious contract and my interpretation of Foucault’s three key elements in pastoral power define the themes I will be looking for in my analysis of Bush’s rhetoric, which I detail in the following sections.

The Rhetorical Contract

For my categories of analysis related to the concept of civil religion, I plan to look to Roderick Hart’s rhetorical contract. The rhetorical contract is central to my study in determining President Bush’s implementation of the contract terms, civil religion, and his new pastoral power. To address the rhetorical contract between the president and organized religion, I am looking for instances where President Bush openly acknowledges his—government’s—obvious cooperation with organized religious bodies. For example, does President Bush mention any specific faith-based organizations in his addresses, or is his faith-based initiative a more nebulous concept? Does the involvement of the faith-based community constitute a breach of the contract Hart identified?

In the contract, Hart identifies four items of agreement between government and organized religion. Using these four agreed-upon traits, I will analyze Bush’s addresses to identify departures from the ideals, which include maintenance of the guise of separation between church and state affairs, maintenance of the guise of existential equality between church and state, maintenance of appropriate language on the part of government officials, and protection of the contract terms from the public at large. For example, consider the first element whereby the

government official should maintain the guise of separation between government and organized religion. Specifically linking the two qualifies as a departure from the norms of the rhetorical contract, as the following quotation demonstrates:

But governments can and should support effective social services provided by religious people, so long as they work and as long as those services go to anyone in need, regardless of their faith. And when government gives that support, it is equally important that faith-based institutions should not be forced to change the character or compromise their prophetic role.

(Bush 2003b)

Bush's consistent rhetorical departure from these elements means he may be rightly accused of breaching the contract—even though he does infrequently speak in accordance with the contract. This is important because it points to the possibility that Bush may be redefining the concept of civil religion in a way that could possibly affect future presidents. That is, future presidents may not feel the pressure to defend the wall of separation between church and state as vigorously, which could lead to even more religious influence in national affairs. Given the long-standing success of America's civil religion in uniting a religiously diverse public, such a drastic change has implications for the very functioning of the heretofore successful secular democracy.

Guise of Separation

Hart identifies one agreed-upon principle between government and organized religion as being the guise of separation. Hart states that “The guise of complete separation between the first party and the second party will be maintained by both parties” (Pulpit 44). This means that, even as representatives of government and organized religion agree that they work together in the rhetorical execution of the civil religious contract, their outward appearance should be that of

separate entities. As separate entities, they have distinct roles in serving the public. In reality, of course, “God and government are enwrapped in each other’s arms continuously” (Hart, Pulpit 54-55). Maintaining appearance of separation is critical to placating those who would view the collaboration of the two as a threat to the effectiveness and mission of both religious and governmental institutions.

I will look to Bush’s discourse for evidence of the violation of the guise of separation, places where Bush makes the relationship between his ideal government and organized religion explicit, as, for example, in the document he authored describing the faith-based initiative:

Government cannot be replaced by charities, but it can and should welcome them as partners. We must heed the growing consensus across America that successful government social programs work in fruitful partnership with community-serving and faith-based organizations—whether run by Methodists, Muslims, Mormons, or good people of no faith at all. (2001g)

In another example, Bush remarks that:

This community and faith-based initiative is a vital part of this administration’s program to help save lives. We’ve opened up federal grants to the faith community for the first time. I shouldn’t say “for the first time.” Most vigorously, let me put it to you that way. (2004f)

These quotations show that, while Bush is aware of the potential pitfalls of melding organized religious groups and government in the execution of social welfare, he intends to implement the strategy anyway, and regardless of Congressional reluctance: “Congress needs to hear the call. Congress needs to not thwart efforts” (2003e). In sum, says President Bush, “We must welcome

faith, and Congress must not block these important initiatives. There are lives to be saved; there are soldiers in the army of compassion ready to save them. And the federal government ought to be on the side of the soldiers in the armies of compassion” (2003e). Even as federal government and religious organizations side together, there still remains the issue of equality between the two.

Guise of Equality

The next component of the contract stipulates that both parties must maintain the appearance of equality. Hart phrases this agreement as follows: “The guise of existential equality between the first party and the second party will be maintained by both parties, but the second party’s realm shall be solely that of the rhetorical” (Pulpit 44). This means that religious organizations should not have the means to affect public policy in modern times, unlike government. Hart explains that the church “can make words about social conditions and governmental priorities but it cannot enforce its will directly and immediately as can government” (Pulpit 57). Given this agreement, the actions of religious organizations with the end of affecting public policy in the Bush administration may be viewed as a breach of the contract. In fact, writes Hart, government uses religion “for the greater honor and glory of the United States government” (Pulpit 57). This is important because it shows that government should have more influence in the social arena than church; yet the two portray themselves as equals to the public at large. Again, when executed in accordance with the contract, this guise serves to maintain the critical balance between the two forces in daily public affairs.

I will look to Bush’s discourse for evidence of the violation of guise of equality, places where Bush makes plain the power of organized religion to influence policy under his administration, as, for example, in his speech on the faith-based initiative in Pennsylvania, where Bush says: “No government policy can put hope in people’s hearts or a sense of purpose in

people's lives. That is done when someone, some good soul puts an arm around a neighbor and says, God loves you, and I love [sic], and you can count on us both" (2002c). Similarly, in an address regarding welfare reform, Bush proclaimed:

Government can hand out money. We do a pretty good job of it. But what government cannot do is put hope in people's hearts or a sense of purpose in their lives. That's been the fallacy of the federal-government-only approach to helping people help themselves. When we find programs that work, when we find a place that is actually effective at helping people, this government will welcome such programs. That's why I'm here [Holy Redeemer]. We welcome this program. (2002e)

This quotation not only suggests the shortfalls of government in affecting social relief, it also points to the general character of the organizations receiving funds. For example, the mission of the Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ is, in part, as follows: "Holy Redeemer will serve the community as a holistic ministry, touching mind, body, and spirit. A group of unique people, disciplined for the purpose of life enhancement, participating in a Pentecostal experience of God and fellowship" (Holy Redeemer, "Holy Redeemer Mission"). As the preceding quotations show, Bush routinely emphasizes what government cannot do in the service of reducing social problems. Government has restrictions that the faith-based charities do not. Bush simultaneously promotes the activities of faith-based groups and de-emphasizes the equality between organized religion and government, particularly as "These [faith-based] groups don't have giant bureaucracies, and endless rules in which they become entangled" (2002h). Federally funded faith-based policy does not have to endure the same scrutiny as governmental policy. In sum, Bush believes that social work (for example, helping children of prisoners, domestic

violence victims, and so on) is “beyond the reach of government, and beyond the role of government” (2001j). As such, government and organized religion are not equal entities, and the traditional balance between them is upset. This is further evidenced by the president’s language regarding the faith-based initiative.

Appropriate Language

Another agreement between government and organized religion in the contract deals with the language each entity shall use. In fact, Hart says that the maintenance of the rhetorical balance between sacred and secular language is “the most important feature of the contract” (Pulpit 61). A consistent and enduring balance is critical in that it ensures that no one component gets privileged over another, thus ensuring a united public—each interest is represented equally. Hart’s agreement stipulates that religious officials’ language should refrain from being too political, and the language of government officials should refrain from being too religious. This is a complicated proposal, especially as government officials, the president in particular, are known to express sentiments in religious terms—particularly during ceremonial occasions. Other addresses, such as State of the Union addresses, may be less religious in tone. A key component is audience, and what language that audience is prepared to accept. The American audience is, after all, the witnessing party to the contract between government and organized religion.

I will look to Bush’s discourse for evidence of the violation of appropriate language, places where Bush’s justification for his policies is couched in unabashedly religious language, as, for example, in his speech to the charity So Others Might Eat, where Bush says:

[W]e ought to thank God for our blessings, for our families, for our fantastic country, for the greatest country on the face of the earth. We ought to thank Him for the protection that we’ve received since the [9/11]

attack; thank Him for our blessings, but at the same time seek ways to help, seek ways to help our fellow human, seek ways to save a heart, seek ways to save a soul. (2001e)

In fact, many of President Bush's addresses, whether to religious or nonreligious groups, include references to God other than in the traditional opening and closing statements of the address.

Moreover, Bush routinely uses direct Biblical references to reinforce a point or justify a policy.

For example, in an address to the Conference of Mayors Bush remarks:

America can be saved, one heart, one soul, one conscience at a time. The pastor of Rosedale, Dennis Talbert is fond of quoting a passage from the Book of Romans: When I want to do good, evil is right there with me. That accurately describes the situation of many of our children in America. Evil is what his church is fighting against, with impressive results. And it's worth noting that Rosedale's outreach programs are financially supported by the Department of Justice and Michigan's Family Independence Agency, among others, and it shows what is possible. (2001n)

While this quotation is an example of Bush's tendency to quote Scripture, as with the mention of Romans, note also that the guise of separation is violated in this rhetorical act as the religious group in question is supported by and partnered with federal and state agencies. Also consider the following quotation from a speech delivered to a group of community leaders: "I firmly believe God is on the side of justice and reconciliation. But as Martin Luther King said, God isn't going to do it all by Himself" (2002i). Bush not only claims to know God's will but also that his faith-based promotions are critical to the execution of God's will.

President Bush uses religious belief to justify his position that participants in the faith-based initiative have the innate capability to challenge social evils. Over and over again in the sample, Bush calls on his audience to “love a neighbor.” This suggestion comes from Mark 12:31 and Leviticus 19:18 and states, in part; “Love your neighbor as yourself” (BibleGateway). In fact, Bush’s call for citizens to love their neighbors is a prime theme of the entire faith-based initiative. For example, the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives produced a document titled “Guidance to Faith-Based and Community Organizations on Partnering with the Federal Government.” The very first page contains the following statement: “Faith-based and community groups are the unsung heroes in helping Americans in need. Their compassionate care and neighborly love turn lives around and provide hope where it has been missing. These groups do not provide care because they have to, but because they want to” (OFBCI 1). Loving one’s neighbor is the major theme, but note also what is unsaid about the forced role of the federal government in tending to a neighbor’s need. The religious language component of the contract is linked very closely with the contract terms to maintain the guise of separation between the two entities as well as to maintain the guise of equality between the two. Bush’s religious rhetoric unveils the guise.

Safeguarding Contract Terms

The last element of Hart’s contract states that neither party shall reveal to the public the exact extent of their relationship or the terms of the contract “in any fashion whatsoever” (Hart, Pulpit 44). Failure to maintain the guise of separation, by overt reference to cooperation between government and religious institutions would thereby violate the contract. Giving religious organizations a pronounced role in government programs, not to mention generous federal funds, would also violate the contract. A government official’s use of religious language outside a

ceremonial event would similarly be against the contract terms. Most of all, the revelation of the very real partnership between organized religion and government to the American public is forbidden by the terms of the contract. Maintaining the various guises and conceptions of the role of the two parties serves to grease the daily workings and keep the public content civil pietists as they have largely been since Bellah's identification of civil religion.

I will look to Bush's discourse for evidence of the failure to safeguard the contract terms from the public, places where Bush makes plain the relationship between his administration and organized religion, as, for example, in a radio address, where Bush says: "I absolutely know that the great strength of the country lies in the hearts and souls of our citizens. And Congress must recognize that, by enabling such faith-based programs to flourish all across the country" (2001f). This quotation is telling for a few reasons. First, note his emphasis on the role of the "souls" of the American people in strengthening the nation. Souls are generally not within the province of a government official. Also, by incorporating the citizens in his proposal, they will necessarily discover the true relationship between government and organized religion.

To the extent that the contract may have been breached by President Bush, such an action may be explained by Bush's new pastoral power. In the contract terms, while religion is acknowledged as a partner and a force in government execution of national affairs, it still is decidedly less influential. Using Bush's new yet old pastoral power, however, the role of religion looms large and greatly influences government programs affecting large segments of the population. The balance of the two powers is upset, and the result is a disharmony and divide among a public that was heretofore united under the, albeit deceitful, arrangement of government and religion under the terms of the rhetorical contract.

Pastoral Power

When Michel Foucault wrote “The Subject and Power,” he identified the following three characteristics of the new pastoral power exercised by government officials: first, that the goal is to ensure salvation of people in this earth-bound world; second, that the number of associations able to provide pastoral assistance is increased; and third, that constituents be understood on both the personal and the community level (“Subject,” 215). In Foucault’s new pastoral power, the only religious relevance is that it was founded in the church’s application of pastoral power. In Bush’s hands, new pastoral power enthusiastically reincorporates the religious element. The three elements of new pastoral power are detailed in the following sections.

Salvation on Earth

The salvation element of pastoral power exercised by a government official acting on behalf of the state differs from that of a traditional pastor because of the locus of salvation: Earth-bound versus heaven. Foucault explains that in the Christian pastoral power tradition, the religious official is concerned with ensuring salvation in the next life, after a person has died. In the new conception of pastoral power, the official executor of pastoral power is primarily concerned with securing an individual’s salvation in this Earth-bound life (Foucault, “Subject,” 215). Foucault suggests that such salvation necessarily includes attention to a person’s health and living conditions, security, and personal protection (“Subject,” 215). Foucault calls these aims “worldly.” This is important because it limits the reach of such aims and policies to the here and now—there is no concern for the afterlife as such. Thus, this category of analysis depends on measurable benefits suggested by President Bush, such as health care benefits, cost of living benefits, and other means of improving living standards.

Pastor's Agents

Foucault declares that as the government official exercises pastoral power over his secular flock, he necessarily has to increase the number of officials to aid in implementing and enforcing this power. Such power may be “exercised by private ventures, welfare societies, benefactors and generally by philanthropists” (Foucault, “Subject,” 215). Public and private institutions are charged with the care of individuals. Lynn Blake writes that “pastoral power was part of a wider web of intersecting disciplinary and sovereign powers” (81). This points to a blending of the authority of church and state institutions. Therefore, I am looking for specific groups selected by President Bush in the extension of his application of pastoral power.

The Office of Community and Faith-Based Initiatives is key to this particular element of Bush’s application of new pastoral power. While its mere establishment may suggest a breach of the traditional bounds of civil religion, does the actual content of President Bush’s speeches regarding the office go beyond the limits of civil religion and its attendant rhetorical contract?

Individual and Community Knowledge

Because the goal of salvation is Earth-centered and because there are multiple agents charged with assuring this salvation, there is a necessary “development of knowledge of man around two roles: one, globalizing and quantitative, concerning the population; the other, analytical, concerning the individual” (Foucault, “Subject,” 215). Foucault did not elaborate on this element of pastoral power in his article “The Subject and Power.” I therefore looked to other scholars who have used pastoral power to see how they interpreted the individual/community knowledge component of pastoral power. Explanation of individual and community knowledge is often only cited verbatim in texts that address pastoral power; it is not explained and detailed sufficiently to be a helpful category of analysis. Lynn Blake explains that “while Foucault lingers

on the individualizing aspects of pastoral power, he makes only a brief allusion to its role in the regulation of the Christian population” (81).

Blake, however, provides invaluable insight. She suggests that Foucault’s conception of governmentality has the family as a central feature. Blake explains that “effective” government is accomplished by means of the governor understanding the three types of government, which Foucault defines as self government, governing a family, and governing the state (82). Therefore, writes Blake,

the lines of government extend continuously to include the prince, the family and individuals within its purview. It is at this point that government becomes individualizing, and the connections between governmentality and pastoral power become apparent: good government enables individuals to ‘behave as they should’. However, these connections hinge on the family. (82)

“The family,” says Blake, “provided the model for good government” (82). To be successful, the governor had to govern as if he was the “head of a family,” responsible both for the individual and the collective (Blake 82). In fact, the family is “the basic unit of a population, and re-emerges not as a model of government but as an instrument of government: knowledge of the family provides the basis for a statistical accounting of the population as a whole. Thus, the population, its pursuits and products—its very life—become appropriate objects of state management” (Blake 82).

Therefore, the best means to understand the individual in relation to the community is through the medium of the family. Given this interpretation, my analysis of pastoral power in President Bush’s addresses will seek to identify statements that link the individual and community in a cohesive course of action or belief through the *family* unit. By influencing the family, the “basic

unit” of a community, the individual and the community she lives in are also influenced. The goal is to unify using “individualizing power” as a means of controlling the public “in a continuous and permanent way” (Foucault, “Pastoral,” 136).

These three elements of the new pastoral power (that is, assurance of salvation in this world, increasing the number of agents of pastoral power, and individual/community knowledge) provide rules for my analysis of President Bush’s oratory—particularly the second element. The second element deals with increasing the number of agents of pastoral power, and I suspect that Bush’s faith-based initiative precisely reflects this category. If so, then perhaps he has breached the contractual element of the guise of separateness between himself, as representative of government, and organized religion. If not, then his actions may be explained by the renegotiation of the contract each president must conduct, as Hart suggests.

Again, I emphasize that my conception of Bush’s new pastoral power marks a diversion from Foucault’s new pastoral power. Whereas Foucault’s version has religious overtones only in its origin in Christian teachings, President Bush’s new pastoral power infuses the new with the old religious, specifically Christian, pastoral power. By introducing religious ideals into the Foucaultian secular governmental execution of new pastoral power, Bush institutes a unique new hybrid power that effectively breaches the rhetorical contract.

Summary

If President Bush has maintained the rhetorical contract as proposed by Hart, his language and execution of the contract is simply an example of how each president makes personal changes to the contract upon assuming the duties of President of the United States of America. If, however, his language indicates that he has consistently failed to follow one or more elements of the rhetorical contract, this suggests a different force at work. I plan to use three elements of new

pastoral power, loosely based on Foucault's conception, to interrogate the same set of Bush's first-term speeches regarding his faith-based initiative. If elements of new pastoral power are evident in those addresses, then President Bush may be said to have broken the rhetorical contract and enacted a type of coercive power not successfully implemented by government in a very long time. Bush's notion of that power, informed by religious precepts and agendas, may serve to alienate parts of his constituency. An emphasis on Bush's newly religious pastoral power, particularly the element whereby the number of agents of that power are increased, effectively segregates the population into believers and nonbelievers. As the figurehead of American government, the president's role is, more typically, to foster a unity based in secular law and the various founding documents of the country.

What is at stake is the future rhetorical execution of the presidency. That is, if President Bush successfully breaches the rhetorical contract, then the stage is set for his successors, should they have similar beliefs, to do the same. Over time, a mandated partnership between organized religion and government may lead to theocracy—certainly not the democracy so prized and revered by Americans to date. Thus, the civil religious tradition that essentially has been in effect since the founding of the country will necessarily fall by the wayside. Furthermore, if President Bush's rhetoric reveals that he is also using his new pastoral power as a means to force his worldview on the public, this also has implications for the future separation of church and state affairs. Government may not protect religious belief and practice, and it may mandate them for the citizenry. Government action and interaction with the citizens in Bush's new pastoral power model infuses Christianity into that citizenry.

In sum, I plan to use the components of the rhetorical contract and new pastoral power as categories of analysis in the interrogation of President George W. Bush's first term rhetoric

regarding the faith-based initiative. To review, the characteristics of the rhetorical contract are 1) to maintain the guise of separation between government and organized religion, 2) to maintain the guise of existential equality between government and organized religion, 3) to make sure the government representative's language is not too religious, and 4) to keep the contract terms from the public. The elements of Bush's new religion-laden pastoral power include 1) individual salvation in this world, 2) an increase in the number of agents of pastoral power, and 3) an understanding of the individual and the community.

To establish the maintenance of the contract by Bush's predecessors, next I sample a small number of their texts with an emphasis on the four elements of the rhetorical contract. I also look for elements of pastoral power in those same texts. Once I establish a baseline against which Bush's rhetoric may be judged, I then turn to Bush's texts in chapter three. Chapter four presents a synopsis of my findings and the conclusion.

Chapter II: The Presidency, Civil Religion, and Pastoral Power

America's president is uniquely charged with upholding the nation's civil religion given that he is the "central figure in this American civil religion of ours" (Hart, Pulpit 10). As the country's leader, the president is furthermore expected to foster unity in the American populace. Many scholars have written about presidents' actions and the degree to which those actions and attendant rhetoric serve to unify or divide the increasingly diverse American population.¹⁵ The president is considered "the symbol of the nation" and is "expected to further the hopes and dreams of the American nation," in large part through addresses to the public (Davis 234). By his own admission, President Bush has failed to unify the American public, the result of which is a cultural divide. The divide is worsened by Bush's embrace of Christian principles and methods in the execution of government affairs—particularly as Bush's constituency becomes more and more religiously diverse.

If, as the literature suggests, presidents have historically served as unifiers of a diverse republic and purveyors of civil religion, a brief analysis of their implementation of civil religion via the terms of the rhetorical contract is in order. A look at the historical role of some of George W. Bush's predecessors is important because it provides a standard by which to analyze his rhetorical performance in office. Bellah asserts that "[t]he words and acts of the founding fathers, especially the first few presidents, shaped the form and tone of the civil religion as it has been maintained ever since" (Bellah, "Civil Religion," 7). While the Founders certainly articulated civil religious concepts, each of their successors has similarly and "enthusiastically" articulated

¹⁵ See for example, Beasley, Campbell & Jamieson, and Stuckey.

and elaborated the civil religious tradition (Mallaby 19). According to Robert Linder, every president since the nation's founding has practiced and articulated civil religion (1). While, as Hart suggests, each president must renegotiate the rhetorical contract (Pulpit 44), still there are boundaries that have not been breached since scholars began studying presidential rhetoric for such components. Civil religion and its rhetorical contract are, indeed, breakable.

For my analysis, I chose to study presidents since the Second World War as a baseline against which to measure President Bush's texts. This is a reasonable starting place since "the discussion of 'civil religion' rose in the United States especially after World War II" (Stackhouse 279). In addition, presidents in the post-World War II era faced exigencies that would call such rhetoric into being. For example, the threat of Communism and the Cold War forced Americans to delineate their own faith to distinguish them from the godless, communist "others." Most important, the role of religion in American public life changed after the Second World War. The end of World War II, therefore, marks the beginning of my evaluation of President Bush's predecessors' rhetoric. Included in this analysis is a look at how each post-World War II president handles the civil religion component of his duties through his address. Again, this is an exercise to establish a common standard by which to evaluate George W. Bush's rhetoric.

In the sections that follow, I examine speeches by each post-World War II president from Truman to Clinton with an eye toward each president's implementation of Hart's rhetorical contract between the president as representative of government and organized religion. For each president, I've selected one inaugural address because, according to Campbell and Jamieson, the president's inaugural address is an occasion when the president is expected to unify the public through his rhetoric following a divisive campaign (Campbell and Jamieson 15). I have also selected a speech in which each president was in the position to define his view of church and

state relations, or was speaking to a group that may be characterized as religious, like the Southern Baptist Convention, for example. In such situations, the question about the relationship between church and state would likely arise. Furthermore, if there was to be a rhetorical breach of contract by a president, these would be the types of environments in which that would be most likely to occur.

To select these speeches, I performed a search on [The American Presidency Project](#) web site looking for events during which each president might be expected to address the role of religion and government in the nation's affairs. I also used the site's search feature to locate instances of words and phrases such as "religion and government," which produced plentiful results for my analysis. Each of the speeches, of course, has a specific audience. The composition of the audience affects a president's words just as the occasion itself. A president who is with a sympathetic audience regarding the role of faith in government is more likely to relax the rhetorical contract. Conversely, a president who is addressing a decidedly secular audience may tend to be more aware of his language—that is, his language will have some strategically positioned religious elements consistent with the rhetorical execution of civil religion. Additionally, I will look at each speech for evidence of one of the three traits of pastoral power. Evaluating Bush's post-World War II predecessors and their handling of the rhetorical contract, as well as whether or not they employed any rhetorical tactics consistent with new pastoral power, serves as a baseline against which to evaluate Bush's rhetoric. Once a common baseline has been established, then I can analyze Bush's speeches to see whether or not they conform to that standard.

Harry S. Truman (1945-1953)

President Truman's time in office predates both Bellah's and Hart's detailed accounts of civil religion. Bellah writes that during the Truman administration the tone of civil religion was based in large part on the tensions between East and West: "[t]he confrontation of democracy and 'the false philosophy of Communism'" ("Civil Religion," 16). In the sections that follow, I look at Truman's inaugural address in 1949 and his address to the Federal Council of Churches in 1946 for elements of adherence to the rhetorical contract and elements of pastoral power.

Inaugural Address, 20 January 1949

When Harry Truman assumed the presidency in 1945, it was due to the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. At that time, he did not give an inaugural address, feeling "'like the moon, the stars, and all the planets had fallen on [him]'" (White House, "Truman"). When he won the 1948 election against Thomas Dewey, he was better poised to make a traditional inaugural address to the nation. In the following paragraphs, I analyze that inaugural address for elements relating to the rhetorical contract and, also, pastoral power.

While President Truman does not directly address the relationship between government and organized religion in his inaugural address, he nevertheless maintains the guise of separation by defining the role of government in the nation's affairs. For example, in his explanation of the concept of democracy Truman says that "government is established for the benefit of the individual, and is charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the individual and his freedom in the exercise of those abilities of his" ("Inaugural"). In this remark, Truman makes no reference to a religious role of the government, just government's responsibility to uphold the individual's rights and freedoms, which are consistent with the beliefs central to civil religion. Also, in the context of this speech "faith" does not refer to a particular religious creed. Instead it is

used to indicate a firm belief in the American values Truman lauds in his address. Consider Truman's following assertion:

The American people stand firm in the faith which has inspired this Nation from the beginning. We believe that all men have a right to equal justice under law and equal opportunity to share in the common good. We believe that all men have the right to freedom of thought and expression. We believe that all men are created equal because they are created in the image of God. ("Inaugural")

The faith Truman mentions is faith in American principles as well as a faith founded in religious teachings. As Truman elaborates on that faith, he starts with Americans' belief in equal justice and equal opportunity, secular concerns. He continues with the secular concerns, listing freedom of thought and expression. In summary, he transitions to the belief in equality of men given their creation in God's image.

Regarding the guise of equality, Truman's focus is on the equality of individuals, not of that between organized religion and government. In a nod to the religious basis of many American ideals, Truman elaborates on his conception of communism. He refers to communism as "false," which of course implies that democracy and the sacred precepts which serve as its foundation are "true." Truman affirms this when he remarks: "I state these differences [between Communism and Democracy] not to draw issues of belief as such, but because the actions resulting from the Communist philosophy are a threat to the efforts of free nations to bring about world recovery and lasting peace" ("Inaugural"). That is, Truman does not specifically want to point to a religious faith as a basis of difference between the two philosophies, he is just noting that it exists.

Truman does not use overly religious language in the context of this address. For example, Truman simply mentions “prayers” in the context of needing support in his new, momentous role as president. He says: “I need the help and prayers of every one of you” (“Inaugural”). In the tradition of civil religious discourse, Truman mentions God in strategic places in his address, namely at the end: “Steadfast in our faith in the Almighty, we will advance toward a world where man’s freedom is secure. To that end we will devote our strength, our resources, and our firmness of resolve. With God’s help, the future of mankind will be assured in a world of justice, harmony and peace” (“Inaugural”). In this instance, Truman is calling on God in the capacity of a “wise and just” counselor (Hart, Pulpit 71). God’s “counsels and ministrations provide a reservoir of knowledge and justice for humanity” (Hart, Pulpit 71). Truman’s inaugural is a fine example of how civil religion is rhetorically executed in inaugural address: religious languages and references are strategically placed in the text, but in an unobtrusive way.

Because Truman emphasizes the role of the American people in improving their own lot, America’s role in improving conditions for people around the globe, and on the partnership between the American people and the government, the contract terms are secure. Religious language is used in a general way, not in a specific sense as in a partnership between government and organized religion. For example, Truman says that “We are aided by all who desire freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom to live their own lives for useful ends” (“Inaugural”). Freedom of religion here is in the context of personal activity, not government activity.

Reading the Truman inaugural for evidence of pastoral power reveals the following traits. First is the pastoral power element dealing with salvation in the earth-bound world. In his inaugural address, President Truman does not offer his listeners a promise of salvation in this world. In fact, he lists a series of goals that must be met in order to secure the future success of

America. The success of these measures is only assured to the extent that the American people partner not only with government but also with the peoples of the world to abolish the major stumbling block to their success: communism. Truman points to a series of ills currently plaguing the country in the aftermath of the war and affirms that each individual must participate in the resurrection of America and extend our wealth beyond the country's borders. The present conditions are not assuredly going to improve, which is contradictory to the element of pastoral power.

The next element of pastoral power involves adding to the number of agents of pastoral power. Truman mentions existing institutions as a means of solving social ills, but does not propose establishing new organizations or recruiting organizations not yet in the fold. For example, Truman states that America has “constantly and vigorously supported the United Nations and related agencies as a means of applying democratic principles to international relations” (“Columbus”). This is significant because the United Nations is a secular entity, of course, but also because it demonstrates Truman's plan to work with existing accredited institutions for the remedy of social ills instead of creating new organizations, particularly those with a religious foundation.

The third element of pastoral power that deals with the individual as well as the individual with regard to her community depends on the successful execution of the first two elements, as Foucault suggests: “the multiplication of the aims and agents of pastoral power focused the development of knowledge of man around two roles: one, globalizing and quantitative, concerning the population; the other, analytical, concerning the individual” (Foucault, “Subject,” 215). In this address, Truman's emphasis is overwhelmingly on the people of the world community, not on the individual in any particular community. For example, he speaks about

“peoples of the earth” and “peoples of the world” acting in concert for the betterment of global society, accomplished in part by the efforts of the United Nations. Truman only uses the concept of the individual in terms of his rights under Democracy versus Communism. Nowhere does Truman use the term “you,” instead he repeatedly uses the term “we” to explain and advance his vision for the future. Truman’s focus is on the global community without real regard to how a specific individual acts in relation to that community. Therefore, this address is not representative of the final element of pastoral power.

As an inaugural address, Truman’s 1946 speech to the nation adheres to Hart’s rhetorical contract with references to American ideals and beliefs and a limited acknowledgement of a divine force in the nation’s affairs. Each one of the elements of pastoral power is missing from the address. Next, I examine a speech Truman delivered to a more religious audience to see if he maintains the standard set in his inaugural address.

Federal Council of Churches, 06 March 1946

In 1946, President Truman addressed the Conference of the Federal Council of Churches. Considering the nature of the audience (that is, a presumably friendly audience regarding faith-based matters) one might expect Truman’s language and content to be predominantly religious rather than secular and matter-of-fact. While Truman does invoke God and laud religious principles, he is also careful to maintain the rhetorical contract, as defined by Hart.

In the introductory statement to this speech, Truman appeals to and appreciates the differences of his entire American congregation, not just those physically in front of him. Truman begins: “I like to consider this conference, to which you have so kindly invited me, as one which represents no one particular sect or creed, but rather as one which represents the spirit of the worship of God. We are a people who worship God in different ways. But we are all bound

together in a single unity—the unity of individual freedom in a democracy” (“Columbus”).

Truman notes the existence of different kinds of faiths, yet asserts that those may be successfully commingled in a democracy. Note the concept of unity, a characteristic of America that presidents are historically expected to encourage. Appreciating difference but fostering unity is a much lauded aspect of American civil religion and certainly within the bounds of the rhetorical contract designed to support civil religion, the first element of which is maintaining the guise of separation between church and state.

In this address, Truman talks about the way to heal the nation after the Second World War; to that end, his focus is upon faith and the role of faith-based organizations in bolstering individuals for the work ahead. Nevertheless, Truman does maintain the guise of separation between government and religion. Truman looks to the leaders of and teachings of religion as a basis to renew the morality of and unity among Americans shaken by the war, not to implement any particular government policy. Truman remarks:

If men and nations would but live by the precepts of the ancient prophets and the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, problems which now seem so difficult would soon disappear.

That is the great task for you teachers of religious faith. This is a supreme opportunity for the church to continue to fulfill its mission on earth. The Protestant Church, the Catholic Church, and the Jewish Synagogue—bound together in the American unity of brotherhood—must provide the shock forces to accomplish this moral and spiritual awakening. No other agency can do it. (“Columbus”)

Note that Truman includes the three predominant American religions of the time in his text, reinforcing the unity theme. Where moral repair is needed, the religious organizations are best equipped to intervene and make positive changes. This language maintains the guise of separation necessary to fulfill Hart's contract—churches may “accomplish a moral and spiritual awakening” by working together in “active cooperation and inspiration” (“Columbus”). This is important because it clearly situates the work of moral and spiritual revival in the realm of sacred organizations, not secular ones.

Truman emphasizes the equality between government and religion by highlighting two ideals dear to Americans: religion and democracy. He asserts that the “forces of evil have long realized that both religion and democracy are rounded on one basic principle, the worth and dignity of the individual man and woman” (“Columbus”). While based on the same principle of individual worth, religion (church) and democracy (state) are separate yet equal entities. Because Truman is addressing a religious group, naturally his emphasis is on the role of religion in healing the country's wounds and moving forward. He states that “nothing will do more to maintain the peace of the world than the rigorous application of the principles of our ancient religion” (“Columbus”). Again, the emphasis is on the role of religious organizations to uphold and maintain morality, not any specific policy. Therefore, Truman meets this contractual criterion.

Truman's religious language in this instance is appropriate considering his audience of members of the Federal Council of Churches. He uses Biblical ideas to reinforce his position that it is the role of religious organizations to reinvigorate a flagging morality due, in part, to the Second World War.

It would make the effort so much easier if people and nations would apply some of the principles of social justice and ethical standards which have

come down to us from Biblical times. All the questions which now beset us in strikes and wages and working conditions would be so much simpler if men and women were willing to apply the principles of the Golden Rule. Do as you would be done by. Consider the gleam in your own eye and pay less attention to the mote in your brother's. ("Columbus")

This quotation is important because it shows that Truman's language, while religious in character, is also inclusive of various religions. For example, note his mention of the Golden Rule, which is common to many faiths. Given his audience, Truman's use of religious rhetoric is brilliant: his words are not denomination specific, but general and transcendent in accordance with the civil religious tradition.

The final element of the contract entails keeping the public unaware of the cooperation between church and state. Truman makes passing reference to the existence of a relationship between the two, but he does not over-elaborate, as follows:

Nothing could be more helpful in reaching the goal of a decent home for every American—and by that I mean Americans of all races and religions and of all income groups—than the active cooperation and inspiration of the churches of the Nation. By working in your local communities where the primary job and responsibility lie, you can help make this program the success which it must be for home life reflects the Nation's life. It must conform to an ever-rising standard.

To raise that standard should be, and is, the constant aim of your Government. ("Columbus")

This quotation demonstrates that while government is involved in establishing a standard of living appropriate for Americans, it is only in a task so nebulous as raising the bar. Government and organized religion cooperate to realize goals, such as improvement of housing, but the way they will go about that—the specific terms of that cooperation—goes unmentioned. Because Truman offers no concrete examples of how government will work with organized religion to promote social change, the rhetorical contract between government and religious organizations remains intact. Emphasis, instead, is on the role of local communities in the execution of social services.

Analyzing Truman's address for elements of pastoral power reveals the following subtleties. In terms of salvation in this world, Truman makes no reference to saving individuals per se, but rather to improving the condition of the world in general. Truman asserts:

Now that we have preserved our freedom of conscience and religion, our right to live by a decent moral and spiritual code of our own choosing, let us make full use of that freedom. Let us make use of it to save a world which is beset by so many threats of new conflicts, new terror, and new destruction. ("Columbus")

This quotation shows that Truman's suggestion is for Americans to become more involved in the plight of less fortunate others around the globe in light of the dangerous armaments displayed in World War II. With a freedom based upon a "decent moral and spiritual code of our own choosing," people can make a difference on a world scale. Such a plan, however, is not reminiscent of pastoral power because it does not guarantee salvation of particular individuals. Rather, Truman suggests such works as a means of beginning the process of saving the world of which all humans are a part.

Truman calls on existing organizations, and more importantly, America as a whole, to remedy the moral crisis in America, he does not propose to add additional agents to accomplish this task of world renewal. He calls on congregations to welcome veterans into their homes and calls on parents and members of churches to work in helping youth adversely affected by war-time conditions. Truman even mentions the United Nations in the effort to reclaim and reestablish basic ideals in a world recently challenged by the “forces of evil” (“Columbus”). America and its citizens have a responsibility to the rest of the people, not any particular group or organization.

In terms of individual and community understanding, President Truman instead focuses on what is best for the public as a whole. He makes reference to “the common good,” “single unity,” and “mankind” (“Columbus”). Overall, his emphasis in this speech is on the renewal of the community at large. Truman does, however, make reference to the “moral and spiritual awakening in the life of the individual and in the councils of the world” (“Columbus”). While this may seem like pastoral power, note that the emphasis is on the individual in the context of the world rather than any particular community. This is important because it demonstrates Truman’s understanding of the needs of the community, which he is to unite and protect, and not the individual, as pastoral power often promotes.

Summary, President Truman

Merlin Gustafson asserts that, as Truman’s administration occurred during the end of the Second World War, “[t]he nation was experiencing a religious revival . . . and the President’s occasional religious statements were generally in accord with the national mood of that time” (Gustafson, “Religion,” 380). Thus, religious overtones in Truman’s rhetoric would not have been considered out of the ordinary. Gustafson writes of Truman that “[b]asic to his political philosophy . . . was his religious philosophy” (“Religion,” 379). President Truman was a religious

man and felt no hesitation about incorporating religious beliefs into his political dealings (Gustafson, "Religion," 379-380).

Still, Truman maintained a rhetorical balance in his public address. Remember that balance is the key feature of Hart's rhetorical contract. Rather than promote any specific faith, Truman used Scripture and Biblical allusion to illuminate social issues (Gustafson, "Religion," 381). In terms of religion, Truman was a great advocate of religious tolerance (Gustafson, "Religion," 383). He wanted to "promote unity and cooperation among the religious faiths" (Gustafson, "Religion," 383), which is consistent with a primary function of civil religion: to foster a sense of acceptance among those of disparate faiths. Thus, according to Gustafson, Truman's application of civil religion meets the criteria Bellah suggests: it aided in the cohesion of the public and appealed to the transcendent goals of health and happiness of all citizens. An analysis of his rhetoric supports that assessment.

Truman linked tenets of religion and the execution of his duties as president—the end goal of which was to unite diverse people to fulfill the role God had ordained for America. Truman's religious beliefs and actions in the rhetorical execution of the presidency tend toward the prevailing public sentiment of the time (Gustafson, "Religion," 387). After World War II, the American public was adrift and needed the moral compass and guidance that religious precepts could provide. Those ideas found execution in Truman's rhetoric. In sum, Truman's brand of civil religion can thus be considered traditional.

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953-1961)

Much like Truman, Eisenhower used religious precepts to comfort and unify the nation during a turbulent time in history. His first inaugural address communicates just such unity and is a prime example of successful rhetorical execution of civil religion.

First Inaugural Address, 20 January 1953

In his 1953 inaugural address, Eisenhower began his remarks by asking his assembled audience to join him in a prayer. In ceremonial occasions such as an inaugural address, religiosity is more acceptable than it may be in other situations. In fact, the American civil religion is most notably expressed during such ceremonial occasions. Therefore, a literal prayer was likely considered appropriate for the occasion. Part of Eisenhower's prayer was as follows:

Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment my future associates in the executive branch of government join me in beseeching that Thou will make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng, and their fellow citizens everywhere.

Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong, and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby, and by the laws of this land. Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people regardless of station, race, or calling. ("First")

In the first paragraph of his prayer, Eisenhower asks for divine guidance for not only himself, but others in his administration as well, in order to best serve the American public. Such appeals for divine assistance are both common in inaugural address and consistent with rhetorical application of civil religion. While it is an acknowledgement of the role of religion in execution of governmental tasks, it does not reveal a precise relationship, only a request for guidance. Note that Eisenhower makes reference to the nation's laws in the second paragraph. This is important because it shows that, while Eisenhower calls on a higher power for guidance, he also recognizes that the laws of the nation shall govern individual conduct. This sentiment is again expressed with Eisenhower's reference to the Constitution. Eisenhower's opening prayer combines just the right

amount of sacred and secular so as to be well within the limits of the rhetorical contract outlined by Hart. That is, the decidedly religious sections occurred at the beginning and end of the address. Also, Eisenhower calls upon God in the capacity of guidance counselor, not as adjudicator for policy.

The third paragraph of Eisenhower's prayer alludes to the separate provinces of government and organized religion in the execution of the business of the nation: "May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who, under the concepts of our Constitution, hold to differing political faiths; so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and Thy glory. Amen" ("First"). By mentioning the Constitution, Eisenhower again reveals his understanding of the limits of the role of religion. The phrase "under the concepts of our Constitution" establishes that all activities will be performed in accordance with that critically important document. Notice also that Eisenhower mentions "political faiths," which is an acknowledgement of the myriad different perspectives among his constituents, and respects individual choice in those faiths. As the workers' political faiths differ, so too do their religious faiths; therefore, Eisenhower keeps his references to God nondenominational.

While Eisenhower does make many references to the guidance of a higher power in the execution of office, his language is not, in Hart's terms, overly religious. In fact, his mentions of God are only in the context of providing strength and clarity to followers—not as a means of establishing or legitimating national policy. For example, Eisenhower notes how the country is facing new challenges in the second half of the twentieth century, and that those changes and challenges are often difficult to comprehend. He says, "In our quest of understanding, we beseech God's guidance" ("First"). This appeal to God is standard fare in the rhetorical expression of civil religion (Hart, Pulpit 71). It is decidedly nondenominational, and therefore is not alienating.

Eisenhower makes references to faith as providing guidance for each individual as he or she participates in making the country a more fair and generous place. He appeals to faith as a guide without appealing to or referring to religious organizations as partners.

Remarks to the General Board of the Federal Council of Churches, 18 November 1953

Eisenhower's address to the Federal Council of Churches provides an opportunity to uncover his feelings on the relationship between government and organized religion. President Eisenhower begins his address to board members by expressing his humility before addressing the group:

When I think of this body as a religious body, I do feel, you might say, a bit of unfitness for being here. For though I am deeply religious in my convictions, I am *certainly probably* more fully aware than anyone else of my shortcomings as a religious being in the sense that we should like people to be. (“Remarks,” emphasis added)

In this passage Eisenhower simultaneously identifies himself as one of the members of the religious community because of his religious “convictions,” and also points to his unique position, presumably as president, as he is “certainly probably more fully aware than anyone else” of his character in religious terms. Regardless of his certain-probable awareness of his abilities, Eisenhower still maintains the distinction between himself as citizen and himself as president in the opening remarks. It is a delicate balance that he successfully maintains throughout the speech, and in accordance with traditional notions of civil religion.

Eisenhower maintains the guise of separation between government and organized religion by pointing to the fact that government was translated from and therefore founded on religious principles:

I happen to be the Chief Executive of a nation of which the Government is merely a translation in the political field of a deeply-felt religious faith. The Magna Charta [sic], our Declaration of Independence, and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man were certainly nothing else than the attempt on the part of men to state that in their government there would be recognized the principle of the equality of man, the dignity of man. That is a completely false premise unless we recognize the Supreme Being, in front of whom we are all equal. (“Remarks”)

While our nation’s documents may have been founded on and written in accordance with religious precepts, Eisenhower only refers to them in the capacity of remembering that every individual is equal in the sight of God. Religious organizations may provide the morality that guides an individual in his execution of office, but they do not actively cooperate in that execution of office. By emphasizing the definitively foundational role of religion in government affairs, Eisenhower also maintains the guise of equality. That is, without the foundation of religious teachings, government could not function in the interests of everybody. This emphasis on religion places it in the same contextual importance as government, yet also maintains separation.

Even though Eisenhower is addressing a religious organization, his language is nevertheless not overly religious. That is, his references to “the Supreme Being” and God are nondenominational. The overall tone of the address is reverent, repeatedly reinforcing the equality of humans under God regardless of difference. Before that God, he says, each person is “an entity of dignity . . . regardless of his religion or his race” (“Remarks”).

Though Eisenhower links religion and government in the assertion that religious teachings are the moral foundation of government activities, he nevertheless upholds the contract terms. He

urges cooperation between the members listening to his address, not between them and government: “You are cooperating in order that this great recognition that man is after all basically a spiritual being and not merely an animal, or a physical thing, you are cooperating to bring that understanding home with more force to each of us” (“Remarks”). Religious organizations are to propose the equality of man; government is to protect it.

While Eisenhower is certainly an advocate of the “fact” of a religiously-based government, he does not suggest that government can absolutely and only provide comfort or salvation to the individual here on earth. Instead, he insists that there is work to be done, work that he presumes is what the Board members will attend to in their meetings. Eisenhower says: “As I understand it, this body is met to devise ways and means to cooperate in the great religious life of America” (“Remarks”). He goes on to explain that religious groups must promote the understanding of equality—no mention is made of salvation.

In addressing the Board of the National Council of Churches, Eisenhower is communicating to an already established group. His speech charges and encourages them to cooperate among themselves, not with government per se. He does not encourage recruitment or an increase in any particular agency; he speaks only to and of the group at hand. Therefore, he cannot be said to implement the aspect of pastoral power whereby the representative of government seeks to increase the numbers of agents of that power.

Eisenhower reveals his understanding of the community in his discussion of what the group he is addressing meets to accomplish: the cooperation between the various faiths represented in America. In his explanation of specific tasks, Eisenhower refers to the religious community; in terms of equality, his attention is on the individual. The two seem to form separate and distinct entities. In the case of pastoral power, the individual is viewed in terms of himself

and his community. Therefore, Eisenhower cannot be said to exhibit this aspect of pastoral power in this address.

Summary, President Eisenhower

Eisenhower's presidency was different from that of his predecessors because of Eisenhower's "reputation for religiosity, his interest in promoting religious revival, and his carefully structured staff for handling religious matters" (Gustafson, "Religious Role," 709-710). His religious acts as president may be due in part to Eisenhower's upbringing with decidedly religious parents who were strict adherents of Watchtower beliefs, a strain of Jehovah's Witnesses (Bergman 89). While Eisenhower certainly had personal ideas about the important role of religion in private and public affairs, his faith is often criticized and questioned because of his failure to join a particular church until after he was president (Bergman 103). Bergman suggests that it was precisely because of his nontraditional upbringing that Eisenhower initially downplayed his religious belief. Eisenhower felt that his familiarity with a religion other than Protestantism may have been used to question his fitness for the presidency (101). Nevertheless, as president his meetings typically opened with prayers, and he addressed many religious organizations during his two terms (Bergman 102). In fact, Eisenhower was the president credited with starting the prayer breakfasts (Fotheringham 1), a tradition that continues to the present day. Gustafson suggests that the increased dependence on religious precepts during Eisenhower's administration could be due to "the mood of the times," which is a reference to national troubles during his administration in the aftermath of World War II ("Religious Role," 710). Bellah notes that by the end of the Eisenhower administration the civil religious pattern was changing. No longer was the enemy any particular person or nation. Rather, it was a struggle against abstract ideas like poverty and

tyranny (Bellah, “Civil Religion,” 17). Eisenhower’s successor, John F. Kennedy, addressed such civil issues with beautiful articulations of American civil religion.

John F. Kennedy (1961-1963)

Before Kennedy assumed the presidency, he was hard-pressed to reassure the public he would not, as a Catholic, be in any way influenced by orders from the Vatican (Burns 50). Once Kennedy assumed the presidency, he made various efforts to allay fears about such influence. Kennedy’s inaugural address was a means to temper concerns about his personal faith as well as to place him squarely in the presidential civil religious tradition. Other speeches delivered by Kennedy reaffirm this fact.

Inaugural Address, 20 January 1961

In his characterization of the national civil religion, Bellah used President Kennedy’s inaugural address as a prime example. The speech holds true to expressions of civil religion with its strategically placed references to God, the attention to unity, reverence for the Founders, and emphasis on transcendental beliefs that bind the president and the people of the nation (Bellah, “Civil Religion,” 2-4). In terms of Hart’s rhetorical contract, Kennedy may be said to maintain the contract stipulations because he failed to mention organized religion in the speech, per se.

The guise of separation between government and organized religion is maintained in a similar fashion to Eisenhower’s implementation. That is, religious ideals are the foundation of government activities; religious organizations, however, are not partners in the execution of the nation’s business. In fact, Kennedy makes it clear that the citizens themselves are the key players in the resurrection of America and, by extension, the world. Like the guise of separation, the guise of equality is maintained by Kennedy’s insistence on the religious foundation of the nation’s activities. Kennedy says that “the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are

still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God” (“Inaugural”). God gave man rights, but government protects them. Kennedy establishes this fact, and the attendant separation of church and state, in the beginning of the speech.

While Kennedy does mention God in the context of his opening and closing statements, which is a common trait of civil religious discourse (Bellah “Civil,” 2), his speech remains rather secular—detailing the United States’ relationship with allies, adversaries, and all others in between. At the point when he is articulating what “we” Americans and America’s “adversaries” must do Kennedy says: “Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to ‘undo the heavy burdens . . . (and) let the oppressed go free’” (“Inaugural”). This Biblical quotation supports the calls for unity that appear both before and after it. With such unity, the new “world of law” Kennedy envisions will be one “where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved” (“Inaugural”). The quotation is used to support a secular proposal, not to advance any denominational belief.

Given Kennedy’s distinction between the role of religion and the role of government—religious precepts are foundational for government activities, but religious organizations are not partners in government activities—he also safeguards contract terms regarding the cooperation of the two entities. In fact, Kennedy’s emphasis is more on the cooperation of individual citizens with the government to the end of fostering unity and alleviating suffering on a global scale.

Kennedy does not offer his assembled audience salvation in the earth-bound world, as pastoral power techniques indicate. Rather, he calls attention to the decidedly tenuous state of affairs in which America finds itself. Kennedy laments: “The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of

human life.” (“Inaugural”). The text of his speech emphasizes a call to work hard to ensure a better, peaceful future for everyone, even though the task will be long. Kennedy says, that the task “will not be finished in the first one hundred days. Nor will it be finished in the first one thousand days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet” (“Inaugural”). With that quotation, wherein he sees success as being a long time away, Kennedy does not rhetorically enact the first element of pastoral power.

Like his predecessors, Kennedy looks to existing organizations in order to affect social change, he does not propose any additional or new organizations in this address. He refers to the United Nations as “our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support” (Kennedy, “Inaugural”). Instead of adding to the numbers of people and organizations already involved with the administration of the government, Kennedy partners citizens and government in the quest to better the nation and the world of which it is a part: “ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country” (“Inaugural”). By making proposals that include existing resources, Kennedy does not enact the second principle of pastoral power, which is to increase the number of people involved.

In his inaugural address, Kennedy focuses on the individual to the extent that the individual is responsible for contributing to the good of the overall community. Kennedy says to his audience: “My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man” (“Inaugural”). His suggestions for individual activities are in the service of helping others to provide salvation in this world; emphasis on what the individual has to gain is not his primary concern. Therefore, this element of pastoral power is not notable in his address either.

Greater Houston Ministerial Association, 12 September 1960

Another example of Kennedy's application of civil religion is his speech to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association, delivered 12 September 1960, before he was even elected. Concern over Kennedy's Catholicism was abundant during the time he delivered this address, as he states "it is apparently necessary for me to state once again—not what kind of church I believe in, for that should be important only to me—but what kind of America I believe in" (Kennedy, "Address"). In this quotation, he places his belief in America before his personal faith. Kennedy goes on to say that he understands that "the separation of church and state is absolute" ("Address"). He expands on this theme throughout the relatively short speech to assure his listeners that his personal religion will in no way influence his activities as president, in other words, assuring his audience that the bases for policy will not be derived from any sectarian theology. Kennedy assures his listeners that he sees the presidency as "a great office that must be neither humbled by making it the instrument of any religious group nor tarnished by arbitrarily withholding it—its occupancy from the members of any one religious group" ("Address"). He makes clear that he understands the limits of his office, particularly with regard to religion. Kennedy calls on transcendent values, values that supercede sectarian theologies, to garner support from those he addresses in their capacity not as Baptists, or Christians, or Catholics, or Jews, but as Americans. He ends his address by, as many of his predecessors and successors did, calling on God to help him "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution," the preeminent sacred text of the American civil religion (Kennedy, "Address").

Kennedy was apparently very attuned to the potential problems a decidedly religious presidency could cause and assured his listeners that he was fully cognizant of and agreeable to the separation of church and state. He affirmed that his religion was a personal matter only, that

officials of any religion would not have undue effect upon his administration. Any religious influence that would threaten to unravel “the whole fabric of our harmonious society” would not be tolerated (Kennedy, “Address”). Kennedy, with the metaphor of the unraveling fabric, recognizes the power of sectarian religion to divide us in our identity as Americans. His speech to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association is an excellent example of articulated civil religion.

Summary, President Kennedy

Before his election, there was concern about Kennedy’s being Catholic in faith: could a Catholic run the country without being influenced by personal belief? Kennedy articulated his position on personal belief in his Address to the Ministerial Association, leaving no doubt that as president he would uphold his duties. So too, was the case in his inaugural address. In that address, Kennedy made the same plea as presidents who had come before him—calling the nation to assemble as a unified whole to perform the tasks ahead. As an articulator of the nation’s civil religion, Kennedy was a gifted orator. Whatever religious foundation or belief he may have expressed, Kennedy’s language is not in line with that consistent with pastoral power. His successor, Johnson, especially needed the unifying and calming potential of civil religion in a time of national unrest.

Lyndon B. Johnson (1963-1969)

In the wake of the Kennedy assassination, President Johnson was left with the task of reconstituting the public after a major national crisis. It is at just such times that civil religion in general and religious language in particular are most useful (Hart, Pulpit 47). Johnson’s speech to Congress five days after Kennedy’s death calls mourning Americans to come together in a trying time: “We will serve all the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans.

These are the United States—a united people with a united purpose” (“Address”). President Johnson closed his speech with the following:

I profoundly hope that the tragedy and the torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our hour of sorrow. So let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain. And on this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord’s blessing, and give Him our thanks, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words: America, America, God shed His grace on thee, And crown thy good With brotherhood, From sea to shining sea. (“Address”)

In this quotation, Johnson uses themes of unity and faith to bolster his American audience during a trying time. Johnson asserts that, by working together with faith in the nation, the American people could overcome the tragedy of Kennedy’s death and continue the social reforms he started. Johnson’s appeals to the Lord are made on behalf of the entire country, and the public is reminded to be thankful for the blessings it has received, even during its time of grief. Johnson’s words were absolutely appropriate for the occasion, and exemplify the rhetorical execution of civil religion. Note also that Johnson makes a point to mention the holiday, Thanksgiving, a decidedly American tradition, as an appropriate time to celebrate national unity. Closing with words from “America the Beautiful,” Johnson incorporates the nondenominational God and, again, reasserts the unification of the country—prime aspects of civil religion. Johnson was similarly successful in articulating the civil religion in his inaugural address of 1965.

Inaugural Address, 20 January 1965

In Johnson's only actual inaugural address, he again incorporates the unity theme so essential to civil religious rhetoric, stating in the very first paragraph of that address: "My fellow countrymen, on this occasion, the oath I have taken before you and before God is not mine alone, but ours together. We are one nation and one people. Our fate as a nation and our future as a people rest not upon one citizen, but upon all citizens" ("Inaugural"). As Hart suggests, unification is a primary goal and result of the successful application of civil religion. By starting his inaugural with reference to that unification, Johnson set the tone for the remainder of the speech. The covenant Johnson established in this address is between Americans and the land, that it was "[c]onceived in justice, written in liberty, bound in union, it was meant one day to inspire the hopes of all mankind; and it binds us still. If we keep its terms, we shall flourish" ("Inaugural"). Johnson himself also covenants with his constituents, pledging to work together in executing the country's business. His language reflects the religious makeup of the country at the time (mostly Jewish and Christian people), and thus manages to include all Americans engaged in this agreement. In the remainder of the speech, Johnson expands on the terms justice, liberty, and union with the end result of verbalizing key components of traditional civil religion. The secular words "justice," "liberty," and "union" are sacred to the American public, and Johnson's using them is a means to enact civil religion through discourse. Furthermore, these words are representative of ideals and values already held by his American audience. Using such terms in this context reinforces their meaning and reminds the players in the covenant to strive to uphold these American ideals.

In addition to the unity theme, Johnson also appeals to the transcendent nature of his and his constituents' mission on earth: "Men want to be a part of a common enterprise—a cause

greater than themselves. Each of us must find a way to advance the purpose of the Nation, thus finding new purpose for ourselves. Without this, we shall become a nation of strangers” (“Inaugural”). Here, Johnson performs a rhetorical balance between the national purpose and the individual purpose. This notion of balance is critical to the execution of civil religion through language. Like other presidents, Johnson does make reference to God in the opening and closing paragraphs of the inaugural address. This is an example of the frame Bellah refers to: references to the divine are strategically placed in an address for structural purposes (“Civil Religion,” 2). In sum, Johnson’s inaugural address is a prime example of the rhetorical execution of civil religion with its calls for unity, emphasis on transcendent goals, and invocation of the divine for strength and assistance. He makes a covenant with the people and provides the history of the country as an example to inspire them to action.

With regard to the rhetorical contract, Johnson’s performance is within the norms established by his predecessors and articulated by Hart. For example, the first contract term is that there must be a guise of separation between church and state. In his appealing to his audience to work together, Johnson tells his audience: “Let us now join reason to faith and action to experience, to transform our unity of interest into a unity of purpose” (“Inaugural”). This statement is an example of how sacred “faith” and secular “reason” are conceptualized as two different, yet related and important, means to solidify the nation.

Johnson maintains the guise of equality by successfully balancing sacred and secular in his speech. For example, Johnson says of the American covenant that “justice was the promise that all who made the journey would share in the fruits of the land” (“Inaugural”). Notice in this quotation that justice, a secular term, and “fruits of the land,” which is a phrase found in the Bible in sections such as Deuteronomy, Numbers, and Isaiah (BibleGateway) serve as actual

counterbalances to one another in the sentence, one appearing at the beginning and one at the end. This implies that the sacred and secular work together, each one informing, enabling, and supporting the other as equals.

Johnson does use religious language to make various points in his inaugural address. However, while President Johnson does make references to God, they are in the context of God's not assuring a smooth and trouble-free future. Instead, the people have to work hard together to assure the common good: "Under this covenant of justice, liberty, and union we have become a nation—prosperous, great, and mighty. And we have kept our freedom. But we have no promise from God that our greatness will endure. We have been allowed by Him to seek greatness with the sweat of our hands and the strength of our spirit" ("Inaugural"). Here, Johnson is invoking God in His role as the Witnessing Author (Hart, Pulpit 71). Hart says that this role is the one whereby God has given license, and then "watches his creations from afar" (Hart, Pulpit 71). This is consistent with the civil religious invocation of a divine being and within the bounds of the rhetorical contract.

The last element of the contract, the safeguarding of the contract terms, is similarly upheld by Johnson. He tells his audience: "Justice requires us to remember: when any citizen denies his fellow, saying: 'His color is not mine or his beliefs are strange and different,' in that moment he betrays America, though his forebears created this Nation" (Johnson "Inaugural"). Here, Johnson keeps the contract terms safe by promoting the acceptance of each person's views, however different from one's own. In general, Johnson maintains the contract terms by also maintaining the balance between sacred and secular in his address as, for example, when he encourages his audience members to "join reason to faith."

The first element of pastoral power is that there is an assurance of salvation in this world as opposed to the afterlife. Johnson does allude to conditions and the means by which they can be improved, but he certainly does not offer any promises. For example, Johnson says: “The American covenant called on us to help show the way for the liberation of man” (“Inaugural”). While this statement promotes the idea that there can be personal freedom during a person’s lifetime, note that it is not guaranteed. Instead, we can “help show the way,” which emphasizes the majority of the responsibility rests with the individual. As spokesman for the nation, Johnson says: “We believe that every man must some day be free” (“Inaugural”). The key, of course, is “some day.” Conversely, pastoral power suggests that salvation can be found on earth in an individual’s lifetime.

In this address, Johnson does not make reference to increasing the number of people who exercise pastoral power. Instead, he focuses on the role of his assembled audience in managing change so that people are benefitted. He makes reference to his partners in the ongoing business of America: “And to these trusted public servants and to my family, and those close friends of mine who have followed me down a long winding road, and to all the people of this Union and the world, I will repeat today what I said on that sorrowful day in November last year: I will lead and I will do the best I can” (“Inaugural”). He thereby unites all of the existing players in the goal of improving the lot of America, the “Union,” and, indeed, the “world” without the need of new agencies or public servants.

The third element of pastoral power, where the statesman has knowledge of the individual in particular and that individual’s reference to community is similarly lacking in this address. Johnson says: “We must work to provide the knowledge and the surroundings which can enlarge the possibilities of every citizen” (“Inauguration”). His focus is on “every” citizen instead of “a”

citizen or “the” citizen. Also, Johnson articulates humanity’s precarious position as a great community, saying “Think of our world as it looks from that rocket that is heading toward Mars. It is like a child’s globe, hanging in space, the continent stuck to its side like colored maps. We are all fellow passengers on a dot of earth. And each of us, in the span of time, has really only a moment among our companions” (“Inaugural”). This quotation demonstrates Johnson’s understanding of a very large, world community, and removes individual emphasis. Johnson’s message is that “By working shoulder to shoulder together we can increase the bounty of all” (“Inaugural”). His sustained emphasis on the community means that Johnson is not rhetorically applying this aspect of pastoral power.

Johnson closes his inaugural address with a Biblical quotation attributed to Solomon: “Give me now wisdom and knowledge, that I may go out and come in before this people: for who can judge this thy people, that is so great” (“Inaugural”). While this might appear to violate the contractual term of being overly religious, such appeals for wisdom are common in the rhetorical execution of civil religion, particularly at the end of a speech.

Dedication of the Agudas Achim Synagogue, 30 December 1963

In another example of Johnson’s execution of the rhetorical contract, consider his speech during the dedication of a synagogue, an event where he might be more at ease with religious expression and possibly speak in defiance of Hart’s rhetorical contract. Regarding the first tenet of the contract, Johnson articulates the spirit of separation in the following quotation:

[O]ur Constitution wisely separates church and state, separates religion and Government. But this does not mean that men of Government should divorce themselves from religion. On the contrary, a first responsibility of national leadership, as I see it, is spiritual leadership, for I deeply believe

that America will prevail not because her pocketbooks are big, but because the principles of her people are strong. (“Remarks”)

This quotation demonstrates Hart’s claim that religion and government have never been completely separated (Hart, Pulpit 54). The emphasis is on “men of Government.” That is, individuals who participate in the governing of the nation should have some measure of spiritual belief in order to execute the duties of office. This is important because the emphasis is on the religious nature of the individual, not the institution. In the same quotation, Johnson successfully maintains the guise of equality. He gently partners sacred “spiritual leadership” and secular “national leadership” to describe the means by which “America will prevail” (“Remarks”). By so closely pairing the spiritual and national leadership of the nation, and by taking such great care to balance those two instances of leadership, President Johnson stays within the boundaries set by the contract.

Because President Johnson is speaking at the dedication of a synagogue, some religious language is appropriate. Speaking about America’s recent trial with the assassination of President Kennedy, he remarks that “the only place that real strength is to be found [is] close to God and the works He would have us do” (“Remarks”). He also acknowledges the fact that God’s purpose is not so easily realized: “We cannot always do God’s purpose, but we can always try to do His will. The man who does, and the nation whose people do, have the hope of reaching new heights” (“Remarks”). In these sentiments, Johnson makes plain that individuals have the capacity to better the country. God is invoked as a means of guidance in that work. This is a portrayal of God that is common in civil religious discourse, what Hart calls “God the Wise and the Just” who provides his followers with guidance (Hart, Pulpit 71). Johnson has provided the audience with his views and has encouraged them to pursue personal activities in accordance with what they perceive to

be God's will. The language is both appropriate for the audience as well as uplifting and encouraging.

Given the audience, Johnson is burdened with keeping the contract terms safely obscure. While Johnson does acknowledge the partnership of sorts between religious and government affairs, he certainly does not reveal the extent to which they partner. This is reinforced by the fact that he references the Constitution early in the address. Johnson elaborates on the role of temples like the one he is dedicating, that they should be "temples where man can worship, temples where justice reigns, temples where the free are welcome, temples where the dignity of man prevails" ("Remarks"). The work of the religious organizations is independent of yet supportive of government. The relationship between the two is sufficiently vague that there is no violation of the contract in this case.

Elements of pastoral power are elusive in Johnson's remarks. In this address, President Johnson does not offer religion in general and the partnering of religious and government entities in particular as a means of earthly salvation. Instead, he offers religious ideas and references to God in a bid to bolster his audience in the wake of the Kennedy assassination. In fact, the present very much depends on the work of individuals and is not guaranteed. He looks to the future for the betterment of society: "the real hope of a universal peace lies in achieving universal morality, decency, and brotherhood. There is evil in our times, as there has been in all times, but the history of mankind is a history of good triumphing" ("Remarks"). Notice his use of the word "achieving," which is to say that the morality and such required for a better universal condition have not yet been realized. Furthermore, Johnson also focuses on history to emphasize the long progression of time in realizing such goals. Thus, the salvation of an individual in this world is not guaranteed.

While Johnson does acknowledge people in the audience who have worked hard to make the occasion and dedication possible, he does not bid them to go forward and recruit others as the directives of pastoral power would have him do. Praise is enough: “If we have leaders like this good man who introduced me . . . then America will truly be worthy of the leadership that we claim, and the rest of the world will follow where we lead” (“Remarks”). Leaders, it seems, are already acting in the service of the country. All that remains is to locate them. Johnson offers no recipe for locating and recruiting other leaders, however.

Instead of focusing on a particular individual and his or her relation to the community, Johnson instead focuses on the community—and on a very large scale, using words such as “universal” and making references to “the nation.” He notes how the city of Austin, for example, has been an example of community formation: “From many lands, from many cultures, men brought their families here to escape oppression, to escape war, to search and seek for peace” (Johnson “Remarks”). This quotation reveals the extent to which the community figures in his conception of Austin in general and America at large. He suggests that if people unite and work together that “America will truly be worthy of the leadership that we claim, and the rest of the world will follow where we lead” (Johnson “Remarks”). Johnson’s focus is clearly on the community at large and on a global scale.

Summary, President Johnson

Pauley writes that “[i]n this civil religious view of the world, Lyndon Johnson plays the role of the nation’s prophet/priest” and calls Americans to action (G. Pauley 42). Johnson used civil religion to appeal to distinctly American ideals such as justice, liberty, and union, not any specific religion in particular. His brand of civil religion can be called traditional—he uses it in an attempt to bring the populace together, not to advance any particular denominational belief.

Johnson “kept the line between church and state reasonably clear, if not the line between religion and politics” (McCarthy 1). He both enacted and understood the traits of civil religion, and, based on this small sample, applied them traditionally. Furthermore, elements indicating pastoral power are elusive in the addresses I sampled. He maintains the transcendent unifying ideals of civil religion by being nondenominationally devout, even given his location at a synagogue.

Richard M. Nixon (1969-1974)

Bernard Donahue looks at the contest between Nixon and McGovern for president in terms of religious symbolism. Donahue asserts that “Nixon’s religious symbolization was couched in terms of” civil religion (59). By using the elements of civil religion, Nixon gave additional credence to his propositions. That is, “the political cosmos needs the support of a religious cosmos for the sake of the legitimacy which it can offer” (Donahue 63). The resonance that Nixon’s use of such symbols achieved with the public is attested to by the fact of his election.

First Inaugural Address, 20 January 1969

Like most inaugurals, Nixon uses the ceremonial occasion to appeal to the sense of unity of the American people, saying: “In the orderly transfer of power, we celebrate the unity that keeps us free” and “Greatness comes in simple trappings. The simple things are the ones most needed today if we are to surmount what divides us, and cement what unites us” (Nixon, “Inaugural”). Unity, a theme central to civil religion, is also apparent in Nixon’s recognition of the black/white divide in America: “No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not. To go forward at all is to go forward together. This means black and white together, as one nation, not two” (“Inaugural”). Such calls for unity are bolstered by the traditional components of civil religion, when effectively and rhetorically expressed. The following sections analyze Nixon’s first inaugural address considering those components.

In the case of his first inaugural address, Nixon does adhere to the stipulations of the rhetorical contract. Regarding the guise of separation between government and organized religion, Nixon neatly maintains this element simply by not mentioning organized religion. In his view and based on this address, if government is to have a partner it will be the American public. Nixon says: “We are approaching the limits of what government alone can do. Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government, to enlist the legions of the concerned and the committed” (“Inaugural”). Partnering government and “the legions of the concerned and the committed” does not violate the rhetorical contract proposed by Hart. Instead, such a partnership further supports and encourages the unity of the American public.

The contractual element whereby the guise of equality between organized religion and government is similarly maintained by Nixon’s failing to mention a specific religious group or the potential impact of organized religion in government affairs. Again, Nixon points to the people as the true partners with government, since “What has to be done, has to be done by government and people together or it will not be done at all” (“Inaugural”). In fact, this statement actually denigrates government’s effectiveness, but only with reference to the people, not a religious group. Nixon goes on to elaborate:

To match the magnitude of our tasks, we need the energies of our people—enlisted not only in grand enterprises, but more importantly in those small, splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journal. With these, we can build a great cathedral of the spirit—each of us raising it one stone at a time, as he reaches out to his neighbor, helping, caring, doing. (“Inaugural”)

Nixon's measure of equality is that of the relationship between government and the people it represents, whatever their faith. Note, however, his use of the phrase "cathedral of the spirit." Phrases such as this instill a religious tone to his rhetoric in support of community action. Such references are general enough so as not to be untenable to the majority of the American public. Without the mention of a specific sacred group, this contractual element is sound.

In the third category of the rhetorical contract, that wherein the president as the representative of government refrains from using language that is too religious, there are a few key examples in the first inaugural. When Nixon mentions God in this address, it is in the context of God's granting equality to each human being, God's being witness to Nixon's oath of office, God's literal view of earth: "a single sphere reflecting light in the darkness," and God's "blessing on [Earth's] goodness" ("Inaugural"). Such references to God are both common and benign. Nixon's invocation of God is in keeping with the rhetorical tradition established by his predecessors. President Nixon does use some religious phrases in this address. For example, he calls for "the peace that comes 'with healing in its wings'" ("Inaugural"), a quotation from the book of Malachi (BibleGateway). He also uses the example of the "peacemaker," perhaps a reference to Matthew 5.9 (BibleGateway). Such references, however are transcendent, rather like his invocation of God for guidance. Though they come from the Bible, the peace such statements invoke belongs to no particular sect or creed. Nixon is not ministering to his audience, but he is using language to which most relate.

As he speaks within the contract on the prior three counts, Nixon similarly adheres to the fourth element of the contract, which is keeping the exact relationship between government and organized religion concealed from the people. Instead, Nixon conveys his belief that it is the people who are partnering with the government—people of various faiths, presumably—to

address social ills. For example, Nixon says that “For its part, government will listen. We will strive to listen in new ways—to the voices of quiet anguish, the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart—to the injured voices, the anxious voices, the voices that have despaired of being heard” (“Inaugural”). This quotation is important because it reveals Nixon’s conviction that government will be, in actuality, representative of the people and partner with the people in the affairs of the nation. In this address, religious ideals are used to substantiate claims, but Nixon does not wed government and organized religion in an obvious manner.

Nixon spends a good portion of the speech detailing the current conditions of the world. He reflects back and thinks forward in an aim to articulate his version of America’s future: “Forces now are converging that make possible, for the first time, the hope that many of man’s deepest aspirations can at last be realized. The spiraling pace of change allows us to contemplate, within our own lifetime, advances that once would have taken centuries” (Nixon, “Inaugural”). Note the use of the word “contemplate,” which does not imply any certainty, just hope. This is important because pastoral power ensures material salvation on earth. Contemplating and realizing aspirations are not the same thing.

Instead of calling for the creation of additional organizations to increase the agents of pastoral power, Nixon calls on existing resources. He says “To match the magnitude of our tasks, we need the energies of our people—enlisted not only in grand enterprises, but more importantly in those small, splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journal” (Nixon, “Inaugural”). This quotation implies that existing resources must be brought to bear in solving the current crises in America.

Throughout the speech, Nixon’s primary focus is on the community, in particular the world community, rather than on the individual. He speaks to his “fellow citizens of the world

community,” explains that “the people of the world” and “the leaders of the world” relish the current peace. President Nixon explains the relationship between individual and community as follows: “No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not. To go forward at all is to go forward together” (“Inaugural”). This emphasis on group achievement of goals is important because it places less emphasis on individual needs, and is therefore not representative of a pastoral technique.

Billy Graham’s East Tennessee Crusade, 28 May 1970

President Nixon addressed a crowd assembled at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville’s football stadium in conjunction with a visit by Billy Graham to that university. In his address, Nixon outlines the role of faith in previous administrations and points to how that faith might be enacted to ensure a better future for the country. Given the audience and the possibility of contractual breach, this is a good speech for analysis of Nixon’s rhetorical implementation of civil religion.

Nixon makes note of what government can and cannot do, thus maintaining the guise of separation between actions considered the province of government and those of religious organizations and their representatives. President Nixon remarks that “government can provide, as I have indicated, peace, clean water, clean air, clean streets, and all the rest, but we must remember that quality of the spirit that each one of us needs, that each one of us hungers for must come from a man who will address you in a moment” (“Remarks”). The man Nixon refers to, of course, is Billy Graham—a staple in presidential religious circles for a long time. This quotation reveals the two separate functions of faith and government: each is designed to address different aspects of the human condition.

Nixon elaborates on the role of religion in the establishment of a successful country as follows:

I can also tell you America would not be what it is today, the greatest nation in the world, if this were not a nation which has made progress under God. This Nation would not be the great Nation that it was unless those who have led this Nation had each in his own way turned for help beyond himself for these causes that we all want for our young people, a better life, the things that we may not have had ourselves but we want for them. (“Remarks”)

This quotation shows that Nixon appeals to faith as a support and guide in striving for greatness. Calling on God in this fashion is consistent with the civil religious tendency to view God as the “Wise and Just . . . one whose counsels and ministrations provide a reservoir of knowledge and justice for humanity” (Hart, Pulpit 71). Furthermore, note that Nixon maintains the balance between sacred and secular saying that each leader “turned for help beyond himself,” which indicates a transcendent help, in order that “causes that we all want,” presumably secular to be all-inclusive, should be served. Even given the assembled audience and occasion, Nixon’s language is not overly religious. In fact, with the exception of a few references to God, there is no Biblical language as such: certainly no quotes of Scripture. He claims only that with the guidance of Scripture that the future of America is positive and secure.

In his address, President Nixon does not reveal the extent of the rhetorical contract between government and organized religion at all—instead, he focuses on the individual’s relationship with the Lord and how that can influence commonly held events and attitudes. Nixon does not blatantly meld religion and government as a prescription for future policy.

President Nixon does not allude to salvation in this world. In fact, he points to many problems: “the air is dirty. . . the water is polluted . . . there aren’t enough parks; that education is inferior; that health is inadequate; that there is alienation between the races in this country; and that there is also alienation between generations” (“Remarks”). In his opening remarks, Nixon urges the assembled youth to action, saying that they are the next great generation of Americans. Then, he introduces them to this list of problems in which they will necessarily be involved. Even with the myriad problems facing the country, Nixon does see promise in the future. In his address in Tennessee, presumably to a fair number of students given the event’s location at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville’s Neyland Stadium, Nixon calls on the youth of America to get involved in the plight of America. Summoning America’s people to action does not qualify as increasing the agents of pastoral power. Nixon believes that “This Nation would not be the great Nation that it was unless those who have led this Nation each in his own way turned for help beyond himself for these causes that we all want for our young people” (“Remarks”). Nixon’s focus in this speech is on a particular community of Americans: young people who are both responsible for ensuring the future of the country at the same time as they are affected by the ills of the nation.

Summary, President Nixon

As this brief analysis shows, President Nixon rhetorically executed the contract within the terms it proscribes. Also, Nixon does not appear to be applying pastoral power, thus affirming his place inside the tradition established by his predecessors. Wimberly writes that “Nixon’s presidency has been considered a civil religious priesthood” (46). Aside from his inaugural address, where one could expect to find civil religious tenets, Nixon often incorporated civil religious ideals in his speeches to the public (Wimberly 47). However, Wimberly states that Nixon’s brand of civil religion was not used “as a context for judgment on the nation” as it was

with presidents such as Lincoln or Kennedy (57). Nevertheless, Nixon is identified with civil religious leadership” (Wimberly 57).

In The Political Pulpit, Hart details the results of his analyzing many of Nixon’s speeches in an effort to construct Hart’s definition of expedient complexity. In those speeches, Hart found that “Nixon mentioned God selectively throughout his career, his choices apparently being dictated exclusively by the demands of the rhetorical situations he faced” (Pulpit 68). Many of the religious elements, writes Hart, were found in Nixon’s ceremonial addresses, such as eulogies, State of the Union Addresses, and his inaugurals in addition to “‘crisis’ speeches” (Pulpit 68). Hart concludes his examination of Nixon’s civil religious rhetoric by claiming that Nixon used sectarian language mostly for dramatic effect, and that “Nixon’s rhetorical behavior was rather typical of his political predecessors” (Pulpit 69). His successor, Gerald Ford, assumed the presidency in another trying time for the nation, and his civil religious rhetoric reflects that situation.

Gerald R. Ford (1974-1977)

Gerald Ford came to the presidency after the ignominious departure of Richard Nixon. Ford’s transition to power, writes Mary Stuckey, “lacked the usual rituals through which presidents enact and voters witness and affirm the transfer of power; no inaugural address, no parade, no ball” (“Legitimizing,” 28). Thus, Ford did not have the chance to establish with an inaugural speech and attendant events the traditional covenant with the public that his predecessors had. President Ford’s speech delivered after taking the oath of office, however, does contain some religious language in the manner of civil religion. Forced to the presidency by circumstance, Ford called on the public for support.

Remarks on Taking the Oath of Office, 09 August 1974

Ford begins his remarks as president as follows:

The oath that I have taken is the same oath that was taken by George Washington and by every President under the Constitution. But I assume the Presidency under extraordinary circumstances never before experienced by Americans. This is an hour of history that troubles our minds and hurts our hearts. (“Taking”)

In these opening sentences, Ford appeals to his audience as a partner in his execution of office, asking them to support him in his precarious position and under “extraordinary circumstances.” Acknowledging the country’s difficulties in the opening paragraph sets the tone for the remainder of the speech wherein Ford calls on traditional themes in civil religion to rhetorically reunite a country divided by scandal and assure the country’s future prosperity.

Like many of his predecessors, Ford maintains the guise of separation by mentioning the Constitution early in his address, thus signifying his understanding of the rules on which the nation is founded. In addition, Ford maintains the guise of separation by maintaining the rhetorical balance between government and religious affairs. He says “I am acutely aware that you have not elected me as your President by your ballots, and so I ask you to confirm me as your President with your prayers” (“Taking”). “Ballots” are contrasted with “prayers” in this single sentence, and doing so maintains the special character of each. Furthermore, balancing the two also serves to maintain the guise of equality. That is, sacred and secular are invoked in his assuming the presidency, with the sanction of the American public.

In this address, President Ford uses religious language to punctuate his appeals for a united public. In explaining the curious circumstance that is his unexpected ascension to the

presidency, Ford asks for public support in prayers and even goes so far as to assert that he hopes “such prayers will also be the first of many” (“Taking”). This is important because, while there is a religious element, it is expressed in the context of Ford’s asking for support as he “begin[s] this very difficult job” (“Taking”). Another instance of religious language appears when Ford asserts the presence in America of “a higher Power, by whatever name we honor Him, who ordains not only righteousness but love, not only justice but mercy” (“Taking”).

In the context of this address, Ford makes no mention of the relationship between organized religion and government. Religious sentiments are used, true, but then within the civil religious context of appealing for guidance and strength and unity. The emphasis instead is on Ford’s contract with the people in the aftermath of Nixon’s resignation. In fact, Ford states: “I feel it is my first duty to make an unprecedented compact with my countrymen” (“Taking”). The essence of his compact is that he will fulfil his duties with “openness and candor [and] with full confidence that honesty is always the best policy in the end” (“Taking”). In this address, Ford does not breach the contractual term that mandates the safeguarding of the contract’s contents.

While Ford does not assure his audience that conditions will improve immediately in the wake of the resignation of Nixon, he does assure them that “our long national nightmare is over” (“Taking”). This is important because it sets the tone for pleasant dreams—nay, the American dream—to begin to be realized. Similarly, instead of calling for an increase in governmental or civilian agents of pastoral power, Ford instead calls on the existing government and the existing Republic to work together to restore and ensure America’s greatness. History is contingent on the ability of America to “remain strong and united . . . dedicated to the safety and sanity of the entire family of man, as well as to our own precious freedom” (“Taking”). The key, for Ford, is to unite

to “restore the golden rule to our political process,” a process that will take time and the dedication of all people within the sound of his voice.

Instead of focusing on individual actions, Ford focuses his address on the power of the people to affect change and sustain America. To do this, he calls on the memory and words of key Americans, such as Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. Ford reminds his audience that Jefferson “said the people are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty. And down the years, Abraham Lincoln renewed this American article of faith asking, ‘Is there any better way or equal hope in the world?’” (“Taking”). The collective people, therefore, are the means by which the country will resurrect herself as surely as she did during the Civil War. Ford continues, emphasizing the American community as a whole: “there is no way we can go forward except together and no way anybody can win except by serving the people’s urgent needs. We cannot stand still or slip backwards. We must go forward now together” (“Taking”). Ford’s insistence on the collective action of the American people to ensure the success of all does not fit the pastoral tendency to emphasize the individual in relation to her community.

Southern Baptist Convention, 15 June 1976

In June of 1976, President Ford delivered remarks at the Southern Baptist Convention, which was being held in Norfolk, Virginia. He thanked the members for their invitation, stating that he is “the first President of the United States to address [the] Southern Baptist Convention” (“Southern”). His address to this group was the start of an important relationship. Since Ford, presidents have continued to address annual meetings of the Southern Baptist Convention, which in itself challenges the rhetorical contract. In his remarks to the group, Ford encourages them to renew their pledge to make a difference in America on the occasion of the “Bicentennial Year of American independence” (“Southern”). The Baptists, Ford says, have made great contributions to

the strength of the country, and he is calling on them again, but within the bounds of Hart's rhetorical contract, as the following sections shall show.

Ford says of the Baptists that their "rich contributions of religious liberty, democratic principles, social equality, evangelistic fervor, and moral strength have reserved for your people an honored place in American society. You have always jealously guarded the separation of church and state, but you have always believed that private morality and public service can and must go hand in hand" ("Southern"). Ford makes a smart rhetorical move: while he acknowledges the separation of church and state, he also affirms the morality the church and its teachings can bring to an individual's execution of state duties. Thus, there is some differentiation of the characteristics of morality and public service—one is "private" and one is "public"—and Hart's guise of separation is maintained. Furthermore, this is an example of the rhetorical balance so important to Hart's contract. Ford mentions the separation of church and state on one hand, but also affirms the necessity of "private" morality and "public" service. The two elements are very well balanced and serve to enhance, rather than to breach, the guise of separation.

This speech also demonstrates Ford's maintenance of apparent equality between church and state affairs, while also celebrating the important role of each. He states that: "The minister in the pulpit, the teacher in the classroom, the foreman on the dock, the executive in the boardroom, the commanders of armies and navies, the parents of children all share the burden and the satisfaction of leadership fully as much as those who served in government" ("Southern"). Notice all the different occupations and activities he mentions in addition to the different types of people. This is an excellent means of unifying his immediate audience because it identifies many types of occupations yet privileges none. This more also serves to unite, by extension, his larger, American audience. He does not privilege one pursuit, secular versus sacred, over the other. He

only mentions how the two can serve the same immediate end: to help improve the nation.

Furthermore, this is a good example of the transcendent nature of civil religion: that the combined toil of the local individuals is really an example of how the burden is shared.

Given the assembled audience, Ford's language does have a distinct religious component. Because he was speaking to an assemblage of Baptists, Ford was able to mention Jesus, specifically, without ill effect. Ford remarks on the necessity of leaders' good morals in executing the duties of office, with a quotation attributed to Jesus: "For what has a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" ("Southern"). Ford uses other religious ideas throughout the address to reaffirm his insistence on the religiously informed morality of citizens, and Baptist citizens in particular, and their role in the construction of America. In another, more secular context, perhaps Ford's comments would cross the line of appropriate religious language; however, in this context where Ford is addressing the Baptists, his language is appropriate.

While Ford relates the work of government and organized religion in the betterment of the nation, he does not explicitly link the two. Consider the following sentiment:

This rekindling of religious conviction, this new appreciation for Biblical teaching we see in America today, is an encouraging development as we move into our third century as a nation. It means that we will resolve to make our society not only prosperous but noble, not only progressive but constructive. We may come to know peace not as the mere absence of war, but as a climate in which understanding can grow and human dignity can flourish. ("Southern")

Again, like his predecessors, Ford uses religion and faith as tools to guide Americans through their daily life with the end goal of improving society. Note Ford's mention of "Biblical"

instruction. This is important because it points to the fact that, during the mid 1970s, the makeup of the nation was still largely Judeo-Christian and therefore his language would not be alienating. The average person could identify with Ford's words. Note also Ford's careful balance of attributes: "prosperous" and "noble" and "progressive" and "constructive." Dialectical pairs such as these serve to reinforce the balance present throughout the speech, contributing to its overall balanced tone. In sum, President Ford's appeals to government and religious organizations are not for collaboration, but rather mutual acknowledgement of what each has to offer. The rhetorical contract is sound.

In this address, President Ford does allude to the tradition in new pastoral power to promise salvation on earth. He says: "While we are far from attaining heaven on Earth, we can make this Earth a better place to live. That must be our constant goal, whether we labor in government or in the kingdom of God" ("Southern"). Ford's brand of salvation is slightly different, however. Note that he says improving conditions on the planet "must be our constant goal." This suggests that the goal is on-going, that there will be no definitive completion of that goal; therefore, the goal will likely not be realized in the near future. His audience is not assured of an improvement in conditions, but must act as if they are. This slight difference makes Ford's utterance incompatible with pastoral power.

President Ford, in addressing the Southern Baptist Convention, is addressing potential agents of pastoral power. That is, the assembled audience can go out into the communities and affect lives of people needing their services directly. Moreover, they do due to the fact that "more and more Americans today are turning for refuge to the safe harbor of religious faith—a fact borne out by your own rapidly increasing membership rolls" ("Southern"). Had such a rise been encouraged and influenced by government, then an element of power could be said to exist.

Baptists enlarging their own ranks does not really qualify as such. On the secular side, Ford does not call for additional people, but instead addresses existing agents of pastoral power: “Public officials have a special responsibility to set a good example for others to follow—in both their private and public conduct” (“Southern”). Again, existing human resources are called upon to fulfil their mission. Ford is not asking for an increase in the number of public officials, just an increase in quality of character of the existing officials.

Instead of focusing on the national community and the individual’s place therein, Ford uses this occasion to focus on the Baptist community. He mentions many great Americans who were either Baptists or somehow affiliated with the Baptists, including Lincoln and Jefferson. Of course, this is appropriate given the audience Ford was addressing, the Southern Baptist Convention. Ford suggests that the Baptists need only continue to do their good works in the communities in which they live, serving as examples to others.

Summary, President Ford

Ford assumed the presidency, as he himself pointed out, under unique and trying circumstances with the resignation of President Nixon. Ford promised Americans he would deal with them fairly and honestly in his remarks after assuming the presidency. President Ford has been described as “restrained” in terms of his application of civil religion (McCarthy 1). Eugene McCarthy asserts that Ford believed he “was acting as God’s humble servant” (1). Even if Ford’s brand of civil religion was, as McCarthy asserts, “restrained,” it nevertheless fits into the tradition established by his predecessors. Ford’s subdued application civil religion was followed by that of James Carter, an openly religious man and self-described born-again Christian.

James E. Carter, Jr. (1977-1981)

Dan Hahn writes that the conditions in America at the time of Jimmy Carter's candidacy allowed him to "stress his religion" (58). Phrases such as "'We ought to make our own societal structure a better demonstration of what Christ is'" affirm that notion (Hahn 58). Carter was considered outspoken in matters of religion, "reporting that he prayed many times a day and that he spoke to Jesus" (McCarthy 1). Hahn writes that Carter's campaigns up to and including his campaign for the presidency had a distinctly religious flavor: "he emphasized his religion in his basic stump speech and included it in almost every speech unless he thought it would hurt him" (60). Scholars and journalists noted Carter's use of religious rhetoric in his address, but were unsure whether such use was calculated or merely indicative of Carter's lack of political savvy (Erickson 221). Hahn suggests instead that Carter was a very religious man in his daily life, and Carter also knew that his religious background would draw a large number of voters.

Inaugural Address, 20 January 1977

In his inaugural address, Carter "celebrated the renewal of the American faith" (Johnstone 248) with the following words: "In this outward and physical ceremony, we attest once again to the inner and spiritual strength of our Nation" ("Inaugural"). Carter cites a portion of the Bible, Micah 6:8 (BibleGateway), to suggest that he understands his task to do "what doth the Lord require" in his execution of office. This is important because it demonstrates Carter's personal belief in and adherence to Biblical teachings, not necessarily the nation's belief. Johnstone, writing shortly after Carter's inauguration, states that "[w]hile it is too soon to tell the extent to which the idea of faith might characterize the Carter presidency, it is not too soon to note that it occupies a central position in Carter's vision of leadership and in his repertoire of rhetorical strategies (248-249). Carter articulated Americans' faith in each other and faith in America,

which was designed to improve the way each member of the public perceives him or herself (Johnstone 242). President Carter made it clear that faith was very important to his execution of the presidency specifically (Johnstone 248). He used religious occasions to articulate such faith in faith.

Regarding the rhetorical contract, Carter maintains both the guise of separation and the guise of equality by pairing sacred and secular in dialectical pairs. For example, Carter tells his audience that “Ours was the first society openly to define itself in terms of both spirituality and human liberty” (“Inaugural”). In this quotation, Carter not only preserves the separation between sacred and secular—naming both “spirituality” and “liberty” as founding principles—but he also establishes their equality by pairing them together. This is important because it demonstrates Carter’s implementation of the guise of equality through the use of dialectical pairs. In addition, this quotation demonstrates the rhetorical balance so central to Hart’s contract.

In his inaugural address, Carter’s religious language is prominent. He begins his address citing Scripture to emphasize that humans should work to fulfil God’s plan with justice and mercy, and, moreover, to perform these duties with a sense of humility. Such direct quotation of Scripture in an inaugural address is evident in other portions of this sample. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, among others, also used direct scriptural quotations. Based on the amount of religious language he used in his campaign for the presidency, the extension of such religious appeals into his inaugural address is not unusual. Furthermore, religious language is common in inaugural address. Aside from the quotation from Micah, Carter uses religious terminology to convey his message of unity in the tasks ahead. The language, however, is not exceptionally religious and is therefore within the constraints of the contract.

Like many of his other predecessors, Carter keeps the contractual terms of the relationship between government and organized religion protected through an insistence on the partnership of the president and the American people. Consider Carter's remark:

You have given me a great responsibility—to stay close to you, to be worthy of you, and to exemplify what you are. Let us create together a new national spirit of unity and trust. Your strength can compensate for my weakness, and your wisdom can help to minimize my mistakes.

Let us learn together and laugh together and work together and pray together, confident that in the end we will triumph together in the right.

The American dream endures. We must once again have full faith in our country—and in one another. I believe America can be better. We can be even stronger than before. (“Inaugural”)

This quotation is important not only because it acknowledges the president's responsibility to represent the people, but it also demonstrates that the president is in a partnership with the American public—each with the goal of “triumphing” in American endeavors with the end goal of strengthening the nation. With no reference to organized religion, but a definite reliance on a spiritual foundation of the nation, President Carter does not violate this term of the contract.

Carter refers to the dreams of the founders in an attempt to revitalize his audience's belief in the possibilities of America. He offers various suggestions about how to instill those dreams in the American public. To say that the dreams of Americans have not been fulfilled and depend on a series of changes to become fulfilled suggests that Carter does not guarantee salvation in this world. For example, Carter says that “The American dream endures. We must once again have full faith in our country—and in one another. I believe America can be better. We can be even

stronger than before” (“Inaugural”). Carter points to tasks still at hand to realize the founders’ dream: “We have already found a high degree of personal liberty, and we are now struggling to enhance equality of opportunity. Our commitment to human rights must be absolute, our laws fair, our national beauty preserved; the powerful must not persecute the weak, and human dignity must be enhanced” (“Inaugural”). In sum, Carter’s language suggests that there is a fair list of goals to accomplish before the earth-bound world is a place of salvation for the individual soul.

Carter appeals to the assembled audience for their assistance in renewing and making real the dream of the Founders. He does not call for additional groups or organizations to secure the promise of America for all citizens. Instead, he focuses on America’s collective actions and the capability of the citizens to improve the lot of all. Carter also refers to the duties of government in affecting change: “Our Government must at the same time be both competent and compassionate” (“Inaugural”). In sum, his address is a call to the existing stakeholders in the fate of America for partnership in realizing the American dream. The current players are up to accomplishing the task without new groups.

President Carter does allude to the pastoral power characteristic of individual and community understanding in the following quotation: “together, in a spirit of individual sacrifice for the common good, we must simply do our best” (“Inaugural”). This quotation demonstrates that President Carter is thinking in terms of each individual’s contribution to the betterment of society. His use of the term “sacrifice” is similarly telling as it alludes to Christ’s sacrifice for humanity. While this aspect of pastoral power is evident in Carter’s inaugural, due to the absence of the other two factors, it is merely an anomaly in this sample.

Christmas Pageant of Peace, 18 December 1980

Like his predecessors, Jimmy Carter allowed a more sermonical tone in his public statements depending on the audience. In his address during the Christmas Pageant of Peace in 1980, and in the context of the American hostage situation in Iran, Carter used religious language to bolster his listeners' personal faith in the outcome of that situation.

In this speech, Carter directly addresses the reality of the church/state divide, and thereby adheres to the rhetorical contract term that the president must maintain the guise of separation between government and organized religion. Consider the following quotation in which Carter makes that division clear:

I am a Christian. I'm very proud of my faith. It's the most important element of my life. But I'm also President of a nation that has a wide range of kinds of religions, and also a President of a nation that believes very fervently in the separation of church and state, which means, to put it in simple terms, that the Government cannot tell any American how to worship. ("Christmas")

By starting off with his personal faith, Carter demonstrates that religious beliefs may be central to an individual's actions, and rightly so. Carter's concern, this quotation shows, is that government might taint religion, and not the other way around. This is important because it reinforces the idea that the two should not seek to directly influence each other. Furthermore, it is significant because, as president, Carter should be spokesman for government instead of a defender of religion. He resolves this paradox by calling attention to the fact that "down through history . . . many people's lives have been lost, much blood has been shed, much hatred has been engendered because of religion" (Carter, "Christmas"). By mentioning potential problems due to religion as

well as positive aspects of espousing a religious faith, Carter maintains the rhetorical balance central to Hart's contract. He articulates the separation of religious and secular concerns and thereby maintains the rhetorical contract.

In the context of the time Carter delivered the address, he maintains a rhetorical equality between actions of religious organizations and governmental agencies by linking the works of both in overcoming the hostage crisis. Carter makes this move by way of a narrative involving the lighting of the national Christmas tree:

Last weekend the families of the American hostages met here in Washington again to have a briefing by the State Department officials, including the Secretary of State, about the status of the negotiations for their release and to receive the information that we have about how those hostages are getting along. I asked the families of the hostages whether or not they wanted all the lights on the Christmas tree to be lit tonight, or whether they wanted us to light just the Star of Hope on top of the tree and then all Americans to pray that the hostages would come home. At that time, we might light the other lights on the tree and celebrate their safe return. The hostage families asked me to do this year the same thing we did last year. And that is just to light the Star of Hope and to hold the other lights unlit until the hostages come home. And they also asked me to ask all Americans to continue to pray for the lives and safety of our hostages and for their early return to freedom. ("Christmas")

This quotation reveals the separation in function between government and faith, yet suggests the two are complementary. As representative of government, including the specific offices he

mentions, Carter affirms the role of the government in “negotiations for [the hostages’] release,” while affirming that, in the interim, their prayers and indeed the prayer of “all Americans” would be instrumental in coping with, not necessarily resolving, the issue at hand.

Carter’s language is rather religious because of his assembled audience, but not inappropriately so given the occasion. Still his use of religious teachings does not violate the contract in that he promotes faith as a means of obtaining personal solace, not as a means to run government. True to the context in which he was speaking, Carter offers the following prelude to a moment of prayer:

And now I would like to ask us just for about half a minute to pray to God fervently for our hostages, their lives, their safety, and their early freedom. If everyone would join me just for a half minute. [Pause for silent prayer.]

Amen. And I want to ask all those who listen to my voice to continue to pray fervently that our prayers tonight for the hostages will be answered.

(“Christmas”)

As the prime figure of national sentiment, Carter uses his speech and the prayer therein to comfort the people, not to prescribe a certain faith or to support the involvement of religious leaders in the resolution of the hostage conflict. As his predecessors, Carter appeals to faith in the service of making America and Americans better, not as a prescription for renegotiating church/state relations.

Summary, President Carter

Because he was a devout man, there was a belief that “Under [Carter’s] stewardship, the American government would exemplify ‘the teachings of God’” (Erickson 221). Erickson asserts

that “*Carter’s religious-political discourse reaffirmed our civic piety and faith in America: his religious discourses communicated trustworthiness, served as a source of identification with evangelicals, and generated media attention*” (222, emphasis original). According to Erickson, Carter’s religious rhetoric was influenced in part by the public’s disenchantment with society as a whole (223). A return to foundational values, such as respect and patriotism, would go a long way to restoring confidence in the public (Erickson 223). There was a belief among people who went to church that “Carter’s candidacy and subsequent presidency [could be] an opportunity to give religion and morality greater national visibility” (Boase 4), but once he assumed the presidency, he did not go far enough to please the far Christian right (Boase 4). As president, Carter toned-down his evangelical rhetoric to better reflect the civil religious tradition.

Ronald W. Reagan (1981-1989)

Allan Fotheringham writes that “God never strays very far from Reagan’s speeches, and in fact manages to make an appearance in almost every one of them” (1); therefore, he may be thought of as “the high priest of civil religion” (Linder 2). Many constituents held the belief that “the Republicans in 1980 found an ideal person in Ronald Reagan who could match religious faith to political works” (Boase 5) and that “he successfully fused the fundamentalist idiom with the political issues” most relevant to the religious constituency (Boase 5).

An article entitled “Mr. Reagan’s Civil Religion,” published in 1984, provides a summary of Reagan’s personal approach to civil religion, where he

first links politics, morality, religion, and government’s need for the church, then warns against intolerance and celebrates the fact that there is a wall between church and state guaranteeing all Americans’ rights to their own religious beliefs or to no belief at all, he is not acting the political

hypocrite, as his critics aver. . . . he is not promoting religion in the sense of the many particular faiths that we know in America. He is preaching something else, and that something is *civil religion*. His own version of it.
(483)

Reagan's civil religion is described as being anchored in "bedrock values," which include "hard work' and 'family' and 'strength and purposefulness in our foreign relations'" ("Mr. Reagan's," 484). Calling for the best effort of the American public is standard in presidential expressions of civil religion, and Reagan was certainly no exception. Kevin Coe and David Domke assert that "Ronald Reagan's presidency was a watershed moment for the confluence of religion and American politics" (Coe and Domke 313). Whether or not his application of civil religion breached the contract can be found in his speeches.

First Inaugural Address, 20 January 1981

President Reagan's inaugural address of 1981 is primarily focused on the problems of economy facing the nation. He successfully manages to connect many of the social ills back to the notion of runaway inflation and big, overinvolved government. Still, his address does have elements relevant to the rhetorical contract and pastoral power. The first element of the contract, maintenance of the guise of separation, is managed by a focus on government activity in the state's and, by extension, the individual's affairs. President Reagan says:

It is my intention to curb the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States or to the people . . . it's not my intention to do away with government. It is rather to make it work—work with us, not over us; to stand by our side, not

ride on our back. Government can and must provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it. (“Inaugural”)

The key phrase in this quotation is “to demand recognition of the distinction” between what is regularly the province of government and, specifically, what is left to the people. While this quotation does not address religion specifically, it nevertheless acknowledges a limit to government’s involvement in the people’s lives and the separation needed to achieve that goal.

Because Reagan does not mention organized religion, and mentions personal expressions of religion in brief in this particular address, maintenance of the guise of equality is difficult to locate in this address. However, in a segment dealing with prayer, Reagan does allude to equality between government and religious concerns: “It would be fitting and good, I think, if on each Inaugural Day in future years it should be declared a day of prayer” (“Inaugural”). By mentioning the inaugural, a secular event, with prayer, a sacred endeavor, he conveys a balance between the two. That is, one complements the other and the guise of equality is maintained.

In this speech, Reagan uses religious language and attendant belief in the traditional civil religious fashion, which is as a source of support: “Your dreams, your hopes, your goals are going to be the dreams, the hopes, and the goals of this administration, so help me God” (“Inaugural”). An example of Hart’s Witnessing Author (Pulpit 71) God, Reagan speaks about religious activities related to his inauguration: “I’m told that tens of thousands of prayer meetings are being held on this day, and for that I’m deeply grateful. We are a nation under God, and I believe God intended for us to be free” (“Inaugural”). The tone and content of this remark is common in the civil religious tradition. The president articulates God’s plans for the nation in positive general terms. Therefore, Reagan has stayed very much within the contractual bounds regarding language that may be too religious.

Reagan safeguards the contract terms between government and organized religion in this particular address by failing to mention a relationship at all, but in two additional ways as well; first, by vowing to reduce government infraction on individuals' choices and second, by focusing on the partnership between and among the country's people. Reagan focuses his attention on the need for change in government in a few sections of this address. For example: "Steps will be taken aimed at restoring the balance between the various levels of government" and "It is no coincidence that our present troubles parallel and are proportionate to the intervention and intrusion in our lives that result from unnecessary and excessive growth of government" (Reagan, "Inaugural"). The implication here is that government as it currently functions needs restructuring and that governmental activities and associations will change as well. Throughout the speech, Reagan also calls on the partnership between Americans to facilitate change. Again and again, he asserts that "we" can do marvelous things to better the nation, with results most evident, in some cases, in the future.

Reagan's predecessors often use their inaugural addresses to promote certain acts with the end goal of securing a better future. The emphasis on future promise dominates his hopes for today: "We must act today in order to preserve tomorrow. And let there be no misunderstanding: We are going to begin to act, beginning today" ("Inaugural"). Reagan does not promise salvation for his audience, instead he relays the hope of a better future—made possible by the hard work of many different kinds of Americans and in many different fields of work.

Instead of calling for an increased number or change in different organizations to manage affairs and improve the lot of Americans, Reagan disparages such special interest groups and instead makes a case for typical Americans and the work they do to sustain the country. President Reagan tells his audience:

We hear much of special interest groups. Well, our concern must be for a special interest group that has been too long neglected. It knows no sectional boundaries or ethnic and racial divisions, and it crosses political party lines. It is made up of men and women who raise our food, patrol our streets, man our mines and factories, teach our children, keep our homes, and heal us when we're sick—professionals, industrialists, shopkeepers, clerks, tabbies, and truck drivers. They are, in short, 'We the people,' this breed called Americans. ("Inaugural")

Reagan's mention of special interest groups is important because it is an acknowledgement of the variously motivated interests competing for primacy in America. He effectively dismisses them when he calls attention to the American special interest group. This group, he says, is largely responsible for the functioning of the country and can influence positive change—in partnership with Reagan's administration.

Toward the end of his speech Reagan gives the story of a soldier killed in action who was, based on the evidence in the soldier's diary, willing to sacrifice himself for the nation. While the reference is to one individual's "pledge," the overall meaning of the message is that the needs of the American community must be served first and foremost. Throughout the address, Reagan's primary focus is upon the role of the American public to work alongside one another to remedy the ills of the country in the future. He says: "All of us together, in and out of government, must bear the burden" (Reagan, "Inaugural"). President Reagan closes his remarks with the comment that "The crisis we are facing today . . . [requires] our best effort and our willingness to believe in ourselves and to believe in our capacity to perform great deeds, to believe that together with God's help we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us" ("Inaugural"). In sum,

his focus is on the collective public's role in realizing the common goals of the nation. His emphasis is on "we," "our," and "us" instead of the individual.

Convention of National Religious Broadcasters, 31 January 1983

In his address to the religious broadcasters, President Reagan uses audience-appropriate language to communicate his vision of the role of faith in American life, stating that "the growth of religious broadcasting is one of the most heartening signs in America today" ("Remarks"). He goes on to say that the people, as evidenced by their "voluntary" monetary support, are "hungry" for the message distributed by the religious broadcasters. Such a prelude might signal the beginnings of a rhetorical collapse of the wall between church and state and the utter negation of Hart's rhetorical contract, but Reagan stops just short of breaching the contract.

In his address, Reagan challenges the separation of church and state by interpreting the words and actions of some of the early leaders of the country, including George Washington, John Adams, and Ben Franklin. In fact, he states: "when I hear the first amendment [sic] used as a reason to keep the traditional moral values away from policy-making, I'm shocked. The first amendment [sic] was not written to protect people and their laws from religious values; it was written to protect those values from government tyranny" ("Remarks"). That Reagan repairs to some of the "saints" of the American civil religion, Washington, Adams, Franklin, as the authorizing agents for his interpretation of the Constitution and that the original intention of these Founders in ratifying/authoring the sacred text of the Bill of Rights is the key issue, clearly places this issue under the jurisdiction of politics. Reagan maintains the guise of separation by articulating his perception of the role of religion in providing a moral basis for the country's laws, which is sanctioned by the Founders and is the true meaning of the First Amendment. He

furthermore does not advocate that religious beliefs be used in the governing of the country in ways not authorized by the First Amendment as he interprets it.

Reagan offers the following to his audience as evidence of his belief in the role of religion in government affairs: “Facing the future with the Bible—that’s a perfect theme for your convention. You might be happy to hear that I have some ‘good news’ of my own. Thursday morning, at the National Prayer Breakfast, I will sign a proclamation making 1983 the Year of the Bible” (“Remarks”). This is important because while Reagan is unifying government and religion by enacting a proclamation, he is also clear that such a move is designed to benefit the public, not the administration. He says: “I hope Americans will read and study the Bible in 1983. It’s my firm belief that the enduring values, as I say, presented in its pages have a great meaning for each of us and for our nation. The Bible can touch our hearts, order our minds, refresh our souls” (“Remarks”). The Bible can be used to influence individual actions and thus affect the nation; his proclamation is only a suggestion, not a law dictating that Americans or the government that serves them must base their conduct on the Bible. What keeps this expression from being a violation of the separation and equality tenets of the rhetorical contract is that Reagan is advocating the Bible, not a particular version of the Bible and certainly not any particular religious organization or denomination.

While much of Reagan’s speech is religious in tone—he quotes the Bible and hymns—his language in the context of the relationship between religious groups and government is rather more understated. It is only the individual’s relationship to faith and degree of faith that he is acknowledging and promoting. His promotion of the Bible as one means of addressing social ills is based on his personal assessment:

We're blessed to have [the Bible's] words of strength, comfort, and truth. I'm accused of being simplistic at times with some of the problems that confront us. But I've often wondered: Within the covers of that single Book are all the answers to all the problems that face us today, if we'd only look there. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand forever." I hope Americans will read and study the Bible in 1983. It's my firm belief that the enduring values, as I say, presented in its pages have a great meaning for each of us and for our nation. The Bible can touch our hearts, order our minds, refresh our souls. ("Remarks")

Withering grass and fading flowers notwithstanding, this quotation is important because it emphasizes the role of religion in an individual's life, not in the activities of government. Religious precepts are best used, this quotation suggests, as a means of comfort and uplift—not as a means to interpret or administer national law. Furthermore, Reagan is appealing to the "enduring values" in the Bible. Presumably these values include justice, liberty, truth, and honor, which should have meaning for the nation. His nonspecific definition of enduring values keeps him within the bounds of the rhetorical contract. Still, as president, Reagan's enthusiastic endorsement of the Bible as a source of wisdom for individuals as well as the nation is problematic. Such rhetoric might be explained and excused given his audience: the National Religious Broadcasters. That is, his assembled, specific audience would likely not be off put by such a suggestion. Had he made a similar remark in a more widely-distributed context, such as an address to the nation, his Biblical endorsement would be questionable.

By addressing the annual convention of the National Religious Broadcasters at all, Reagan does allow some exposure of their cooperation with the government. Reagan acknowledges his

limitations, however, stating “I realize it’s fashionable in some circles to believe that no one in government should order or encourage others to read the Bible. Encourage—I shouldn’t have said order. We’re told that will violate the constitutional separation of church and state established by the Founding Fathers in the first amendment [sic]” (“Remarks”). The phrase “encourage others to read the Bible” is important because, although a president should not endorse the Bible, his suggestion is merely that it be read. Encouraging others to read the Bible and endorsing or enforcing codes of conduct found in the Bible are different actions; the latter would be a violation of the rhetorical contract. By recognizing the limits imposed by the First Amendment, Reagan safeguards the remainder of his speech from potential accusations of impropriety with his comments. Note the use of the term “fashionable.” This term suggests that while Reagan might be aware of the current trend in politics not to meld political issues with religion, it is just a passing phase. In his own application of civil religion, a relationship between religious teachings and the actions of individuals both in the service of government and as civilians is acceptable.

Salvation in this world is one of the elements of pastoral power. In this address, President Reagan lengthily addresses salvation in the context of the abortion debate. He says “let us come together, Christians and Jews, let us pray together, march, lobby, and mobilize every force we have, so that we can end the tragic taking of unborn children’s lives” (Reagan, “Remarks”). Had this goal been accomplished it could have been seen as a promise of salvation fulfilled. In this address, however, Reagan promises a fight, not a victory.

Speaking to the National Religious Broadcasters, Reagan does not advocate for an increase in their numbers, but instead notes the increase already taking place: “in a time when recession has gripped our land, your industry, religious broadcasting, has enjoyed phenomenal growth. Now, there may be some who are frightened by your success, but I’m not one of them. As

far as I'm concerned, the growth of religious broadcasting is one of the most heartening signs in America today" ("Remarks"). In addition, Reagan does laud some existing organizations that have been instrumental in providing social services to people in need of assistance. This is rather like President Bush's advocacy for similar groups to remedy similar ills. The difference is that Reagan promises no funds and encourages no recruitment whereas Bush does, as will become apparent in the next chapter.

While Reagan does comment on individual religious freedom, "[n]o one must be forced or pressured to take part in any religious exercise," Reagan comments at length on the issue of prayer in school, and this is a good example of his emphasis on community. He tells his audience: "last year we tried to pass an amendment that would allow *communities* to determine for themselves whether voluntary prayer should be permitted in their public schools. And we failed. But I want you to know something: I'm determined to bring that amendment back again and again. . . ." (Reagan "Remarks," emphasis added). Still, Reagan's community is a very specific community, as evidenced not only by the group he addresses, but also by the issues he addresses, such as tuition tax credits and abortion.

Summary, President Reagan

In their text "Agendas, Rhetoric, and Social Change: State of the Union Addresses from Eisenhower to Clinton," Donna Hoffman and Alison Howard say that their analysis revealed "a striking increase in religious references in the last two decades of our time series, beginning with Reagan" (16). Before President Reagan, they say, mentions of religion in general and God specifically were typically limited to the opening and closing sections of State of the Union addresses (Hoffman and Howard 16). Reagan instead "sprinkled his speeches with religious references" (Hoffman and Howard 17). Reagan's rhetoric made frequent use of Scripture to

support his policies such as increasing the budget for the armed forces (Boase 6). More than just a tool to unite the public, Reagan used civil religion to justify policy (Hoffman and Howard 18), much as did Johnson before him. This is important because it shows how the rhetorical execution of civil religion changes with each incoming president. Each president sets the tone and precedent for his successor to some degree.

While President Reagan did use religious language, much as his predecessor Jimmy Carter, to communicate American ideals and beliefs, he nevertheless stayed within the bounds of the rhetorical contract as proposed by Hart. Affirming the importance of the First Amendment, he also affirms the separate nature of government and organized religion. He welcomes the teachings of religious precepts as a means of support and guidance for the conduct of the individuals of the country, not as a mandate or Biblical law. While his language is religious, and he does cite Biblical passages, they are rather benign in nature and, again, serve as moral uplift for the listener. Finally, Reagan does not divulge the actual extent of the relationship between government and organized religion—merely that the two have an important part to play in the sustenance of the country.

George H. W. Bush (1989-1993)

Pierard, writing in 1996, attributes “the most far-reaching civil religion statement ever made by a twentieth-century chief executive” to George H. W. Bush, as follows: ““I want to thank you for helping America, as Christ ordained, to be ‘a light unto the world’” (7). Consider, however, his audience, the National Religious Broadcasters. This group had been addressed by Ford, Carter, and Reagan before him. This is important because it establishes a tradition—Bush did not address this audience without precedent. Depending on the audience, presidents appear to adjust their civil religious discourse accordingly. Praise wherein Christ figures centrally may be

appropriate for a gathering of people such as the National Religious Broadcasters. In ceremonial address, where civil religion is also verbally displayed, President Bush, like his predecessors, is mindful of the rhetorical contract.

Inaugural Address, 20 January 1989

In his inaugural address, Bush had to differentiate himself from Reagan (Barilleaux and Rozell 7). In less ceremonial situations, Hoffman and Howard say that the first President Bush “did not include as many mentions of God and religious references in his State of the Unions as did his predecessor [Reagan]” (17). In President Bush’s inaugural address, delivered on 20 January 1989, the nature of civil religion is well established and articulated.

With regard to the rhetorical contract, President Bush does not make any overt mention of a partnership between government and organized religion in this inaugural address. Because he does not mention the cooperation, there is no need to maintain the guise of equality. Religious language is evident in Bush’s inaugural address; however, this language is in keeping with the civil religious tradition whereby the president calls on a higher power for assistance in executing the office of the presidency and for strength of the country. Furthermore, he asks the witnessing nation to participate in a prayer with him:

We meet on democracy’s front porch. A good place to talk as neighbors and as friends. For this is a day when our nation is made whole, when our differences, for a moment, are suspended. And my first act as President is a prayer. I ask you to bow your heads.

Heavenly Father, we bow our heads and thank You for Your love. Accept our thanks for the peace that yields this day and the shared faith that makes its continuance likely. Make us strong to do Your work, willing to

heed and hear Your will, and write on our hearts these words: “Use power to help people.” For we are given power not to advance our own purposes, nor to make a great show in the world, nor a name. There is but one just use of power, and it is to serve people. Help us remember, Lord. Amen.

(“Inaugural”)

While a ceremonial occasion such as an inaugural may call for religious themes or references, Bush’s opening with a prayer is unusual—even though Eisenhower also opened his 1953 inaugural address with a prayer. What makes this particular prayer acceptable in terms of civil religion is its appeal to unity. For example, Bush notes the “shared faith” essential to the transfer of presidential authority, not a particular, denominational faith. Like other inaugural invocations of the divine, Bush appeals to the “Heavenly Father” for guidance, a role Hart calls God the Wise and Just (Pulpit 71). Thus, while the prayer may seem inappropriate and out of place, its message is essentially the same as many simple sentences before it, such as President Nixon’s “confidence in the will of God” (“Inaugural”) or Ford’s plan “to do what is right as God gives [him] to see the right” (“Remarks”). Religious ideals are used as a guide for the moral compass of Americans.

The final stipulation of the rhetorical contract is that government and organized religion should not make their agreement known to the American public. President Bush comes very close to breaching this contractual term, but his vague language serves to keep him just this side of a contract breach, as follows:

I have spoken of a thousand points of light, of all the community organizations that are spread like stars throughout the Nation, doing good. We will work hand in hand, encouraging, sometimes leading, sometimes being led, rewarding. We will work on this in the White House, in the

Cabinet agencies. I will go to the people and programs that are the brighter points of light, and I will ask every member of my government to become involved. The old ideas are new again because they are not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in. (“Inaugural”)

Bush’s lauding of “community organizations” in the task of helping to improve the lives of Americans sounds quite like his son’s plan of including such organizations in addition to faith-based organizations in the area of ministering to the American community. Note, however that George H. W. Bush does not provide specifics about government involvement, merely that government will “become involved.” Furthermore, Bush does not mention religious groups, per se, just “community” groups, and he does not admit that the cooperation between government and those groups is in any way religious.

President Bush avoids the pastoral power element whereby an individual is guaranteed salvation here and now by emphasizing the future: “But this is a time when the future seems a door you can walk right through into a room called tomorrow” (“Inaugural”). To rally his audience, he focuses on a picture of the ideal future. Furthermore, Bush is not interested in ministering to the spiritual needs of the country: “A President is neither prince nor pope, and I don’t seek a window on men’s souls” (“Inaugural”). Instead, he is a secular official.

President Bush articulates in this address a definite precursor to his son’s plan for increasing and employing religious and community organizations, explaining that the “community organizations . . . throughout the Nation [are] doing good” (“Inaugural”). As these organizations are preexisting, President Bush cannot be said to have applied the tenet of pastoral

power whereby the agents of that power are increased. Furthermore, he makes reference to “community” organizations not “faith-based” or “religious” organizations in their efforts.

National Prayer Breakfast, 04 May 1989

The National Day of Prayer in 1989 marked the first occasion where it had “an official permanent date of designation . . . the first Thursday of every May” (“Remarks”). The National Day of Prayer, during which guests come to the White House for breakfast with the first family, provides the president with an opportunity to express his civil religion in a welcoming environment; that is, he would be free to use particularly religious language during such an event. During this particular breakfast, however, President George H. W. Bush maintains the rhetorical contract—particularly with regard to the necessity of separation of church and state.

President Bush greets his audience and proceeds as follows:

I’m glad that together we could commemorate this event, and just for a few moments let me focus on what to me, and I hope to you, this observance means. It does mean, I’m sure we would all agree, that we believe in separation of church and state, but not in the separation of morality, or moral values and state. While the government must remain neutral towards particular religions, it must not, certainly it need not, remain neutral toward values that Americans support. And yes, we believe in pluralism. And I just want to reassure you I believe in pluralism—certainly in mutual tolerance, for we are one nation under God. And we were placed here on Earth to do His work. And our work has gone on now for more than 200 years in the Nation—a work best embodied in four simple words: In God we trust.

(“Remarks”)

This quotation, while acknowledging the formative role religious belief has played in the evolution of the country, also acknowledges the fact that our country's laws discourage the mingling of church and state relations in the execution of government activity. Like his predecessors, Bush appears to rely on religious teachings as a moral foundation or guide for individual action, not as a means of influencing government policy. His mentions of God are those of an appeal for guidance and trust, which is in keeping with the civil religious tradition.

Bush maintains the guise of equality between organized religion and government by articulating his belief that religious ideals are strictly for moral foundations, not as a means of daily governance: "political values without moral values, without that moral underpinning, cannot sustain a nation" ("Remarks"). In fact, he makes it clear that the nation is made up of many different faiths, which are to be respected in the context of a free and democratic America. He uses the content of his recent discussions with Amish and Mennonite people to suggest that religious foundations can protect the individual from some of the more dangerous aspects of life, such as drugs. Yet, he stops just short of endorsing their teachings as a means for government to apply its programs.

Considering the audience of the National Prayer Breakfast, Bush's rhetoric is rather nonreligious. While he does mention God and provides examples of prayers of other presidents including George Washington and Franklin Roosevelt, his speech lacks Biblical quotations and lessons one might expect at such an event. President Bush uses religion carefully, even in this welcoming context. Throughout the speech he promotes prayer and religious teachings as moral guides for individual actions. He does not equate or relate organized religion in government in any overt manner. Thus, he does not breach the contract proposed by Hart.

Summary, President Bush

Therefore, while there may be some assertion that Bush's language in other contexts made him quite the enthusiastic, faith-laden adherent of civil religion, his language suggests he was more restrained and within the tradition established by those who preceded him. Given Reagan's rhetorical success with the public, Bush was left with the difficult task of the successor, to articulate his own ideas regarding the best means of improving the nation.

William J. Clinton (1993-2001)

While Clinton's application of civil religion was broader in scope (that is, he wanted to apply it on a global scale) than that of his predecessors, it was also soundly traditional. With a reliance upon sacred American figures, and classic American values, such as liberty and equality, and the American myth itself, President Clinton projected a definitively American civil religion.

First Inaugural Address, 20 January 1993

In his inaugural address to the American people, President Clinton emphasized the unity of the country and the individuals who make the American lifestyle possible. Clinton remarks:

Today we do more than celebrate America. We rededicate ourselves to the very idea of America an idea born in revolution and renewed through two centuries of challenge; and idea tempered by the knowledge that, but for fate, we, the fortunate, and the unfortunate might have been each other; an idea ennobled by the faith that our Nation can summon from its myriad diversity the deepest measure of unity; an idea infused with the conviction that America's long, heroic journey must go forever upward. ("Inaugural")

Note Clinton's mention of the "myriad diversity" of the American public as well as his assertion that a unity may be achieved despite that diversity. By simply acknowledging the differences he binds them in unity and equality.

In terms of the rhetorical contract's tenets of maintaining the guise of separation and the guise of equality between organized religion and government, President Clinton manages to adhere to these contractual terms by not mentioning the role of religion in government affairs. He often calls attention to the way government should act, bolstered by authority figures such as Franklin Roosevelt. Clinton easily upholds these terms of the contract. He maintains separation by focusing on government's responsibilities.

Like most inaugurals, Clinton does make introductory and closing statements that contain some reference to "the Almighty" and God. Such language is well within the tradition of civil religion and within the bounds of the rhetorical contract. Clinton closes his inaugural address with some religious words, as follows:

And so, my fellow Americans, as we stand at the edge of the 21st century, let us begin anew with energy and hope, with faith and discipline. And let us work until our work is done. The Scripture says, "And let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." From this joyful mountaintop of celebration we hear a call to service in the valley. We have heard the trumpets. We have changed the guard. And now, each in our own way and with God's help, we must answer the call.

("Inaugural")

Clinton's inclusion of religious precepts in his inaugural address is not unusual, and cannot be considered inappropriate—particularly given the fact that some of his predecessors incorporated

actual prayers into their addresses, such as Eisenhower and Reagan. Clinton uses religious language to encourage his listeners to “answer the call” to action in the renewal of America.

Clinton safeguards the terms of the rhetorical contract by, first, not mentioning the role of the church in this address, much as the guises of separation and equality are maintained due to his not mentioning organized religion at all. Second, and more importantly, Clinton emphasizes the role of the people (witnesses to the rhetorical contract) in the nation’s affairs. Clinton laments that “no President, no Congress, no Government can undertake this mission [to renew America] alone,” and therefore calls on the people: “My fellow Americans, you, too, must play your part in our renewal” (“Inaugural”). As his closing statement affirms, Clinton is using Scripture to encourage and uplift his audience; he is not making partnership between organized religion and government apparent to the assembled audience.

Pastoral power’s tendency to assure salvation in the earth-bound world is not evident in Clinton’s first inaugural. In that address, Clinton looks at existing problems in America and asserts that change must be enacted and embraced to secure the future: “To renew America, we must be bold. We must do what no generation has had to do before. We must invest more in our own people, in their jobs, and in their future” (“Inaugural”). While Clinton does have hope for the nation, he does not guarantee imminent salvation, and in fact calls on Americans to make their own sacrifices to ensure the future by “not choosing sacrifice for its own sake but for our own sake” (“Inaugural”). In terms of pastoral power, individual sacrifice will ensure salvation, not anything the government can do. Clinton encourages his audience along this track as follows: “Let us all take more responsibility not only for ourselves and our families but for our communities and our country” (“Inaugural”). To improve the prospects of the future, he suggests, we must all work diligently today.

Instead of calling for any new or fortified agency to help to resolve the nation's problems, President Clinton calls upon the people themselves to unite in improving the country, stating: "My fellow Americans, you, too, must play your part in our renewal" ("Inaugural"). He consistently refers to the people as a whole and how working together can improve the collective condition: "Together with our friends and allies, we will work to shape change, lest it engulf us" (Clinton, "Inaugural"). Furthermore, says President Clinton "In serving, we recognize a simple but powerful truth: We need each other, and we must care for one another" ("Inaugural"). This is important because it demonstrates that Clinton is relying on and advocating the goodness already inherent in Americans—all they need to do is implement that goodness to affect change.

The third element of pastoral power whereby a leader gains individual and community understanding by means of the family is present in Clinton's address. In fact, Clinton eloquently addresses all three in the following statement: "Let us all take more responsibility not only for ourselves and our families but for our communities and our country" ("Inaugural"). Clinton recognizes that these three traits together, when managed correctly and with responsibility, can bring immense power to America: "We must provide for our Nation the way a family provides for its children" (Clinton, "Inaugural"). Clinton, like many of his predecessors, focuses on the family as a means of enabling America.

Breakfast with Religious Leaders, 28 September 1999

In his address to religious leaders, Clinton does an impressive job of communicating the power of religious organizations to help remedy social problems, while still adhering to the rhetorical contract Hart identified.

Clinton states in his introductory statements that "we've been trying to work out what the proper relationship is between religious individuals and religious groups, and government

activity, since we got started as a country” (“Remarks”). By acknowledging that ongoing dilemma up front, Clinton sets the cautious tone for the remainder of the speech. Clinton also affirms the religious diversity typical of the country during his time in office, which complicates matters even as it reinforces the greatness of America: “because of our history of religious liberty and the way our Constitution has worked, more and more religious convictions and affiliations have flowered in our country” (“Remarks”). With continued disagreement about the role of religion in government affairs, Clinton explains his conception of how that relationship is changing:

We also must recognize that there will always be differences of opinion, honestly held and earnestly pursued, about what is the proper role for the government, what is the proper relationship between church and state, in the well-timed and well-used American phrase. But it seems to me that there is kind of an emerging consensus about the ways in which faith organizations and our government can work together, both at the national level and at the State and local levels, in a way that reinforce values that are universally held, and increase the leverage of the good things that the government is funding. (“Remarks”)

This quotation shows that while church and state are two separate entities, there are opportunities for collaboration. In fact, religion can be used to “leverage” government activities. Clinton appeals to the transcendent aspect of civil religion with his mention of “values that are *universally* held.” Regarding the cooperation issue itself, Clinton suggests that consensus on the issue has not yet been reached, but it is “emerging.” This is important because it demonstrates that Clinton is aware that there is still a limit to how much cooperation will pass without incident—he must

proceed carefully. Clinton's suggestion is that people will work out the proper relationship between the two parties, with the goal of increasing the number of "good things" from which the American people can potentially benefit. Clinton says that the two parties should "work together" ("Remarks"). Clinton then proceeds to provide examples of how religious organizations and government have worked together to help American citizens. Clinton says: "I don't think that's a violation of the Constitution's establishment clause, and we sure have helped a lot of people out there" ("Remarks"). Based on Clinton's interpretation of the Constitution, such partnership is acceptable. However, President Clinton has violated the contractual element whereby the guise of separation must be maintained.

Having breached the contractual element whereby the guise of separation between government and organized religion must be maintained, consider the guise of equality in this address. Clinton states early on that government and religion have historically worked together in the betterment of the nation. In terms of equality of the two institutions, Clinton says that ongoing discussions about the relationship between government and organized religion have indicated that faith-based values can "increase the leverage of the good things that the government is funding" ("Remarks"). Religion, in this case, supports government, thus violating the rhetorical contract element that says equality must be maintained. Introducing religion into government affairs as a partner indicates a measure of equality, the overall tone in this address is that religion serves a supporting role, not an equal role.

Even though President Clinton was addressing a religious audience, he does not use religious language inconsistent with the contract terms. For example, there are no quotations from Scripture. Instead, with regard to the partnership between religious organizations and government his language is more general—focusing on common principles, not necessarily religious ones. In

the case of his own affairs, though, Clinton does employ some religious language. For example, he talks about “the pure power of grace—unmerited forgiveness through grace” in the context of his own personal battles after his affair with Monica Lewinsky was finally widely acknowledged. Furthermore, he acknowledges that people “don’t want to discourage people who are in public office from pursuing their own religious convictions and from stating them, but we must beware, as those of us who are Christians are warned, of practicing piety before others in order to be seen by them” (“Remarks”). This quotation suggests Clinton’s humility. That is, he acknowledges that practicing faith is not about gaining praise and recognition by others, nor is it about converting others, but about “pursuing [one’s] own religious convictions” (“Remarks”). Thus, in the context of this speech, Clinton’s religious language reflects the spirit of how the individual makes use of that faith—not the government, and therefore, this element of the contract is not breached.

Like his breach of the guise of separation, President Clinton also breaches the contractual element of revealing contract terms by emphatically explaining the partnership between government and organized religion as an ongoing debate, and then providing examples of the successful partnership. Consider the following statement: “I believe that people of faith could do more to help those of us in public life” (“Remarks”). Clinton gives specifics of cooperation as follows: “I am convinced that the faith community can play a major role in protecting our children from violence, in supporting commonsense gun legislation, in participating in our campaign against youth violence, in forming community partnerships to identify and intervene in the lives of people before it is too late” (“Remarks”). In the context of talking about social ills, Clinton mentions both government’s responsibility and also suggests that community involvement, particularly by those faith-based organizations rooted in the community, can help immensely. His

is a recommendation for action, not a program to be enacted. Even so, President Clinton, has breached the rhetorical contract in the case of this address.

In this address to religious leaders, President Clinton mentions many of the current problems facing the country, especially violence against children. Clinton diagnoses the problem in this way: “the truth is we’re in the fix we’re in because we don’t do enough to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children; we don’t do enough to lead our children away from violent paths into positive paths; and because we don’t do enough to intervene in the lives of people who are disturbed, angry, unstable, and mentally ill before it’s too late” (“Remarks”). Clinton’s emphasis on the fact that “we don’t do enough” precludes any imminent salvation in this world. Clinton goes on to voice his opinion that violent acts are evil, and that people “must do more to prevent and overcome evil with good” (“Remarks”). In sum, Clinton like his predecessors, says there is more to do to improve current conditions.

President Clinton mentions family once in this address—a passing reference to the important value of family. He does, however, spend a good portion of the speech dealing with issues of community. He tells the audience about volunteers who have worked in conjunction with faith-based groups in “rendering community service” (“Remarks”). Furthermore, in addition to the community problems in America, Clinton is particularly concerned with standards of living for all individuals in the world community. He mentions world organizations such as the United Nations, and asserts that America will “have to pay our fair share” (“Remarks”). President Clinton’s emphasis on community does not clearly reflect this aspect of pastoral-type power.

One final note about this speech: a key paragraph in Clinton’s address to religious leaders addresses the role of organizations of faith in improving people’s lives. Clinton says: “And I think there are a lot of people who would maybe be less reluctant to ask for help from someone like you

than to show up at the social service office of the government, or walk right through the front door of a psychiatrist's or a psychologist's office. And we need to think about this. *There is no big magical national solution for this*, but I have examined this" ("Remarks," emphasis added). Here, in the context of the mental health crisis in America, Clinton is alluding to what would become George W. Bush's faith-based initiative—Bush's "big magical national solution" for the ailments of society, irrespective of government. Clinton, conversely, sees no means of implementing a national solution. This naturally leads Clinton to focus on community action and involvement.

Summary, President Clinton

Nneka Ofulue's evaluated Clinton's enactment of civil religion in an article entitled "President Clinton and the White House Prayer Breakfast." Ofulue looks at "the relationship between civil piety and the American presidency" (49)—specifically how President Clinton used civil piety to reestablish his presidential ethos after the Lewinsky affair. Ofulue explains Hart's cooperation between organized religion and government as follows: "Because of its power to awaken in people a reverence for the intangible, Hart argued that government has looked to religion as a resource through which to imbue political leadership and public policy with an otherworldly significance" (51). The balance, Ofulue believes, is a component of the Founders' legacy—a relationship that "permitted no legal entanglement between Church and State," but nonetheless allows "symbolic connections between the religious and political dimensions of American culture" (50). These connections are maintained through rhetorical devices that reaffirm the religious component of the institution of the presidency (50).

Linder writes that while Clinton was in office, his civil religious rhetoric trumped even that of Ronald Reagan, and that "Clinton's civil religion leadership has been both traditional and universalist, and he has been more pastor than prophet or priest" (Linder 4). Linder asserts that

Clinton's usage of civil religious rhetoric went beyond the scope of American politics, but extended to the rest of the globe as well (5). In fact,

Bill Clinton clearly has a well-developed sense of civil religion that flows from the wellsprings of his own spiritual understanding. Moreover, he has the heart of a universal pastor. The world is his parish, and he longs to minister to the entire globe and include it in his civil religious embrace. In so doing, he apparently sees himself as the universal pastor of a worldwide civil religion. (Linder 7)

Clinton's articulation extended beyond America and into the global community, which is a unique application of civil religion. So, while President Clinton did not uphold all of the elements of the contract in his rhetorical execution of civil religion in the context of American governance, he nevertheless articulates the unity and agreement that civil religion promotes.

The Sum of the Predecessors

Taken as a whole, the post-World War II presidents have, as Hart suggests, enacted the rhetorical contract in various ways. While each president does mention the role of religion—extensively or in passing—he typically mentions it in a certain context. That is, religious organizations and the faith they espouse are presented as means for the individual to gather meaning and seek guidance in negotiating the current affairs of the day. While some presidents do make reference to how organized religion and government may work together to attempt to remedy social problems, they do not suggest a formulaic program of actively and obviously mingling the two in partnership. The guise of separation between the government and organized religion is largely maintained.

As for maintenance of existential equality, each president does present organized religion as a means of personal improvement through prayer. Prayer is uniquely an individual pursuit. The overall presentation of religious teachings is, as Hart suggests, predominantly rhetorical. That is, religious precepts are not presented as a methodological approach for implementing specific policy; rather, they are presented as means to individual betterment.

The language used by the presidents in articulating the civil religion varies according to occasion. As scholars have noted, ceremonial occasions are best suited for appeals and references to God. Many times, presidents have inserted their own, personal prayers in such addresses. This is important because it shows, as Hart tells us, that each president articulates civil religion and negotiates the rhetorical contract differently. However, the fact remains that each president, based on my small sample, adheres to the rhetorical contract element that states religious language should be kept in check. That is, presidential address is not an occasion for sermonic language. Instead, Biblical quotations, when direct, usually serve to promote moral teachings that are consistent with American values such as liberty and equality. Religious teachings provide a moral foundation by which individuals act in the world—government individuals, religious individuals, and secular individuals in the American constituency.

In general, President George W. Bush's predecessors do not reveal the exact extent to which organized religion and government cooperate in solving the nation's ills. Nevertheless, some, like President Clinton in his address to religious leaders, provide clear examples of collaboration and inform the general public of that collaborative work. This is not to say that Clinton opened a rhetorical door for Bush, but rather that, again, each president articulates civil religion differently. Still, there is usually some mention of the church and state separation. The separation, furthermore, is lauded as a good and proper state of affairs to protect religious

freedom as well as to prevent the intrusion of religious precepts of any one denomination from becoming too influential in government affairs.

This brief survey shows an increasing amount of mention of the role of religious organizations in the government's execution of duties as the years progress—a gradual change in role in concert with the gradual change in the religious makeup of the country. Before even analyzing George W. Bush's speeches, this much is clear: in the context of this analysis and this limited sample of Bush's predecessors' address, the rhetorical contract has been broken in the past. Thus, Bush's breaking of the rhetorical contract is not unique. What is unique about Bush is his rigorous implementation of a different new pastoral power throughout his addresses concerning his faith-based initiative, as the next chapter will address.

Chapter III: President Bush, Civil Religion, and Pastoral Power

In the first chapter of this project, I provided an overview of the concept of civil religion as defined by key civil religion theorists Robert Bellah and Roderick Hart, and validated its current application using testimony from scholars who have recently written on the subject of civil religion. In sum, civil religion may be defined as “a set of beliefs, symbols, and rituals” exercised in the public sphere that serve as a unifying moral foundation for the American public (Bellah, “Civil Religion,” 4). For example, civil religious beliefs include the certainty that America is the locus of justice, equality, and morality—based in religious precepts. Great historical figures such as Abraham Lincoln are frequently invoked as symbols in the articulation of civil religion, as well as sacred texts like the Constitution. Rituals, such as the inaugural address, are also key to the expression of the national civil religion. Civil religion is best articulated by the president as the symbolic figurehead of the populace, particularly during times of crisis (Beasley, You 4; Hart, Pulpit 47). The concept of civil religion, as detailed in the second chapter of this project, has been consistently implemented by each president since the end of the Second World War.

In this chapter, I turn to a sample of President George W. Bush’s rhetoric to better understand his particular application of civil religion. I sampled forty-one of President Bush’s speeches regarding the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives delivered during his first term in office. For the complete list of speeches I used, please refer to Appendix D: Bush’s First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative on page 226. I selected these speeches for analysis because they best demonstrate President Bush’s proposals for the integration of religious organizations and the federal government in national, societal affairs.

This chapter proceeds as follows: first, I use the four terms of Hart's rhetorical contract to locate instances in Bush's speeches where he challenges, or violates those terms. For example, one stipulation of the contract deals with the secrecy of the agreement between government and organized religion. Does President Bush divulge the extent of that relationship in the sampled speeches? Also, the contract states that there must be the appearance of equality between government and organized religion, but in fact government has the preponderance of power. Does Bush's rhetoric support or challenge that notion? Furthermore, the contract stipulates that the government official's—the president's—language should refrain from being overly religious. Does President Bush sound sermonical, or does he insert religious parables and references sparsely and for dramatic effect? Finally, writes Hart, the parties are not to reveal to the general public the exact nature of their collaboration. Does President Bush, in his discussion of his faith-based initiative, violate that contract term? Has Bush consistently displaced the terms of the rhetorical contract and instead instituted components of his brand of new pastoral power?

To address my conception of the elements of new pastoral power in President Bush's speeches, I search for the following three traits. First, pastoral power is chiefly concerned with ensuring an individual's salvation in this world. To what extent does President Bush acknowledge the potential for Earth-bound profit via the faith-based initiative? Second, new pastoral power seeks to increase the number of agents of that power. Does Bush's rhetoric advocate for the addition or expansion of agencies with a moral or spiritual mission? Third, new pastoral power works through a unique knowledge of both the individual and her relationship to the community. Does President Bush reveal the relationship between the individual and community and is there any promotion of one over the other? How does the family fit in to the individual and community understanding? The consequences of Bush's application of new pastoral power firmly rooted in

Christianity are important because such a philosophy of leadership serves to divide an already diverse American public into those who want Christian religion to play a more formidable role in government activities and those who do not. Furthermore, pastoral power has, in fact, been applied as a means of controlling the public, which negates the concept of freedom, religious or otherwise.¹⁶ Again, the difference between Foucault's new pastoral and Bush's implementation of it is that Bush reincorporates the Christian worldview into this means of exercising power over the electorate. Together, these categories of analysis applied to Bush's first term rhetoric about the faith-based initiative should reveal whether or not he has violated Hart's rhetorical contract and, to the extent he has, how that can be related to his unique techniques of new pastoral power.

The remainder of this chapter is divided into two major sections: one where I examine President Bush's speeches for evidence of his breach of the rhetorical contract, and another where I analyze the same set of speeches for elements of his brand of new pastoral power. To the extent that Bush's remarks breach the contract, he can be said to have transgressed the limits largely adhered to by his presidential predecessors in the execution of civil religion. To the extent that he has rhetorically implemented elements of new pastoral power, he can be said to be trying to control the public in a manner consistent with church practices of individualization. This is important because the American perception of such an agenda may serve to split the American people into at least two distinct camps, thus leaving the unity so central to America and the president's role as leader of America in peril.

¹⁶ In Lynn Blake's "Pastoral power, governmentality and cultures of order in nineteenth-century British Columbia," for example, she explains how techniques of pastoral power were used to govern "Native people" in British Columbia in the 1800s.

Bush's Breaches and the Rhetorical Contract

Roderick Hart says that each incoming president must negotiate the rhetorical contract as he comes into office. Even so, there has been remarkable consistency among post-World War II presidents in the articulation of the American civil religion. Hart's contract contains four specific elements dealing with appearances of separation and equality, language, and the individual in relation to his community, which I use to evaluate the content of President Bush's speeches in the sections that follow.

The Guise of Separation

President Bush breaches the contractual element that states the guise of separation between government and organized religion must be maintained by specifically mentioning the reciprocal partnership between the two. He bolsters and justifies his bid for cooperation by asserting that there has been great discrimination against faith-based organizations with other administrations. Then, he assures members in his faith-based audiences that the government will provide support, often specifically monetary, for their programs.

Hart says that representatives of government—particularly the president—and organized religion must maintain the guise of separation between them (Pulpit 44). In President Bush's speeches, this contractual breach is signified by his open acknowledgment of the partnership between organized religion and government via the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. Key to this element of the contract are the following concepts: the notion of historical discrimination against faith-based organizations, the inaction of Congress that led to President Bush's Executive Order, the role of the directors of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and that office's mission, the role of various Cabinet offices in supporting the goals of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, the systematic means by which

organizations may participate in the program and receive funds, and what the end result of new faith-based policies might be.

During his speeches focusing on the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, President Bush sounds as though he understands the need for separation between religion and government. His proposals, however, defy his language. Consider the following from a speech of 28 July 2003: “Government has no business endorsing a religious creed, or directly funding religious worship” (Bush 2003a). Bush acknowledges the limits of government and religious collaboration, but the acknowledgement is called into being by Bush’s need to make such an explicit demurral. It is a preemptive, defensive gesture, and Bush continues in the same speech with a defense of religion:

for too long, government treated people of faith like second-class citizens in the grant making process. Government can and should support effective social services provided by religious people, as long as those services go to anyone in need. (Applause.) And when government gives that support, faith-based institutions should not be forced to change the character of their service or compromise their principles. (2003a)

Bush’s assertion that government “can and should support effective social services provided by religious people” as long as they are fair about the distribution of such services breaches the rhetorical contract inasmuch as the assertion acknowledges the cooperation, albeit planned and as yet not executed, between the two. What of the government-funded program that has as part of its mission the conversion to a particular faith of people it helps? What about the federally-funded, church-run day-care that uses the Bible as its “handbook?” For example:

This church receives federal funding for child care. It must be comforting for a mom or a dad to drop off his or her child to a child care center run by a church. It's a safe place, to begin with. But it's also a place where there's values. The handbook of this particular child care is a universal handbook, it's been around for a long time. It doesn't need to be invented. Let me see your handbook there. (Laughter.) This handbook is a good book, it's a good go-by. (2004g)

After the dispersal of funds, is the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives capable of providing oversight to ensure that there is no proselytizing associated with the programs? Some programs are quite open about the religious component of their care. For example, Bush praises a program called Silloom Ministries, and describes it as “a spiritually-based program, a program to help elevate the spirit, to make sure people who are despondent and hopeless recognize there is a strong spirit inside them, and then nurture that spirit” (2004c). Any federal funds disbursed to that organization would most certainly be used in advocating faith. In any case, President Bush repeatedly asserts that the reason such faith-based programs in particular are not abundantly funded by government is due to simple discrimination.

President Bush frequently accuses the federal government of discrimination against social service organizations of faith.¹⁷ He believes that there is historical evidence that government has

¹⁷ In addition to the speeches cited in this section, other speeches that contain Bush's assertion of discrimination against organizations of faith include the following: 21 May 2001 address to graduates of Notre Dame, 22 May 2001 address to the National Leadership of the Hispanic Faith-Based Organizations, 24 May 2001 address to congregants of St. Augustine Parish, 01 February 2002 address announcing Jim Towey as the new Faith-Based and Community Initiatives director, 07 February 2002 address at the National Prayer Breakfast, 02 July 2002 address on welfare reform at the Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ, 12 December 2002 address to the Conference on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, 10 February 2003 address to Nashville participants in the Faith-Based Initiative, and 16 July 2003 address to Urban Leaders.

not acted fairly with faith-based programs in the past—that because of the separation of church and state the government was historically leery at best, discriminatory and prejudiced at worst, against such programs. Consider the following statement in an address Bush delivered to the audience of the First White House National Conference on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives:

We're here to talk today about the relationship between people of faith and government policy. I believe it is in the national interest that government stand side-by-side with people of faith who work to change lives for the better. I understand in the past, some in government have said government cannot stand side-by-side with people of faith. Let me put it more bluntly, government can't spend money on religious programs simply because there's a rabbi on the board, [a] cross on the wall, or a crescent on the door. I viewed this as not only bad social policy—because policy by-passed the great works of compassion and healing that take place—I viewed it as discrimination. And we needed to change it. (2004a)

Change regarding faith-based programs begins on the federal level, but Bush has plans for state and local governments concerning this initiative as well. Bush made the following assertion to a conference of Mayors, simultaneously including three levels of government in his initiative plans: “I urge you to work with your governors to make sure that their faith-based offices are up and running, and that they help cut through the inherent prejudice toward faith programs, the inherent prejudice in government” (2004d). City, state, and federal groups must practice fairness in the execution of Bush's initiative. His assertion of “inherent prejudice” on the part of government

toward faith organizations is proof of his belief that discrimination has kept sacred and secular separate for faulty reasons.

There will be no such discrimination and prejudice from his administration, says Bush: “The other thing the federal government must not do is worry about the role of faith-based programs in providing help to people in need. Let me put it a little more bluntly: the federal government should not discriminate against faith” (2002h). Consider Bush’s use of the word “discriminate.” This term frequently has been associated with the civil rights movement and the fight against racism in the country. By purposely using the term discrimination, President Bush is linking the plights of African Americans during the civil rights era and religious conservatives in the twenty-first century. This is important because by doing so he is presenting his conservative, religious program in language consistent with liberal, secular reform. Consider the following series of quotations dealing with the justification of the faith-based initiative in terms of historical discrimination:

[W]e’ll never fund faith, we’ll never fund churches, but we should fund the armies of compassion. We should not discriminate against faith-based programs which exist to help people in need. (2001o)

When we fund programs, we ought not to discriminate against faith-based programs. (Applause.) And we ought not to cause the faith-based program to have to change its mission in order to receive any money. Otherwise it won’t be a faith-based program. It will fall into the old government program. (2002i)

We're [President Bush, Senator Lieberman, and Senator Santorum] in complete agreement that government should not discriminate against faith-based programs, but it should encourage them to flourish. (2002d)

Many acts of discrimination—many acts of discrimination against faith-based groups are committed by Executive Branch agencies. And, as the leader of the Executive Branch, I'm going to make some changes, effective today" (2002c).

It's hard to change hearts when you can't use the power you've got to change the hearts. (Applause.) Government action like this is pure discrimination. (2003f)

[F]aith-based programs deserve the support of our government when they're effective, not to be discriminated against. People shouldn't fear the fact if there's a cross on the wall and an AIDS program in that building. We ought to welcome that. We ought not to fear the Star of David on a wall and an AIDS program ensconced in the building. We ought to welcome it, because the motivation by the people of faith is a motivation to help heal the hurt. (2004c)

[T]he truth of the matter is, there's a culture inside government which resents and fears religious charities, and has discriminated against them. We're changing that. (2004e).

I will continue our efforts to defend the liberty of religious organizations. Faith-based charities have a right to provide publicly-funded social services, just like any other group. You see, our government should

welcome faith. So I have signed an executive order allowing religious charities who seek government support to compete for funding on a level playing field. I call on Congress to codify my faith-based initiative into law, so that people of faith can know government will never discriminate against them again. (2004i)

All of you [National Association of Evangelicals Convention attendees] know the power of faith to transform lives, you're answering the call to love and serve your neighbor. Our laws should welcome and encourage your good works. We should never discriminate against faith-based charities. (2004i)

Government action, presumably, is that which prohibits funds from reaching organizations dedicated to advancing a particular religious faith while also serving the needs of the community. Funding clearly entails collaboration, which when revealed to the public breaches Hart's rhetorical contract. Furthermore, note how President Bush mentions the sense of "mission," that government funds should not preclude the execution of the established missions of the charities receiving federal dollars. To do so would be a form of discrimination.

Bush continues to use the concepts of discrimination and prejudice as reasons religious organizations were kept from collaborating with government in the past. Even so, the fact still remains that he repeatedly breaches the contractual stipulation of the keeping the two at least apparently separate. According to Bush, the country is in such dire condition that the federal government can ill afford to be discriminatory; instead, with Bush's encouragement, it disperses funds to organizations once deemed ineligible for federal dollars. Bush made such funding possible even though Congress blocked his initial plans for the faith-based initiative.

When President Bush first established the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives by Executive Order, commentary by journalists, scholars, and others about the office's inevitably complicated implications was plentiful. Bush was personally invested in the initiative, due to the fact that he, as he has freely admitted in his autobiography, A Charge To Keep, had successfully sought services from the faith community to arrest his drinking problem. Now, as president, Bush has opined: "for too long, some in government thought there was no room for faith-based groups to provide social services. I have a different point of view. I believe government should welcome faith-based groups as allies in the great work of renewing America" (2003b). Bush himself serves as evidence of the success of faith-based programs—programs potentially threatened by the inaction of the Congress to act on Bush's demands, thus requiring an Executive Order.

Throughout the sample used for this analysis, President Bush routinely criticizes Congress for its inaction in establishing a law to fund faith-based organizations through the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.¹⁸ Bush remarked: "We waited for Congress to act. They couldn't act on the issue. So I just went ahead and signed an executive order which will unleash—(applause)—which says the federal agencies will not discriminate against faith-based programs. They ought to welcome the armies of compassion as opposed to turning them away" (2003c).

¹⁸ Speeches containing disparaging remarks about Congress include those delivered on the following dates and to the following groups: 14 March 2001 address to members of Grace Episcopal Church (2001p), 25 June 2001 address to the United States Conference of Mayors (2001n), 09 July 2001 address to America's Promise (2001c), 08 August 2001 address at a Habitat for Humanity Event (2001h), 20 November 2001 address at So Others Might Eat charity event (2001e), 12 December 2002 address to the Conference on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (2002c), 16 July 2003 address to Urban Leaders (2003c), 12 September 2003 address at the Power Center 10th Anniversary Celebration (2003e), 15 January 2004 address to Faith-Based and Community Leaders at the Union Bethel Ame Church (2004g), 03 March 2004 remarks at the Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Conference (2004h), 01 June 2004 address at the White House National Conference on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (2004a), and 03 August 2004 address to the 122nd Knights of Columbus Convention (2004e).

This quotation is important because not only does it indicate a breach of contract wherein government and religion corroborate, but it also shows the lengths to which President Bush is willing to go to enact this questionable policy. He essentially overrules an entire branch of the United States' government to facilitate the institution of his plan. Notice the term “unleash” in that quotation. It implies a certain ferocity in his approach. Unleashing something generally suggests that the unleashed is a momentous force to be reckoned with and some extreme consequences shall follow. Combined with his reference to the “armies,” albeit of “compassion,” the overall sense of Bush's conception of his Executive Order establishing the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives is rather confrontational. Thus, not only does he breach the rhetorical contract, he does so by strong-arming Congress. Bush clearly perceives Congress as an obstacle to the initiative and essentially overrules it. It is Bush's own “mission” that he “remind Congress that they need to fund” the initiative (2003c). Without Congressional approval, Bush turns to the power of the Executive Order. With his Executive Order in place, Bush then starts the business of identifying the key figures in and mission of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

Since the creation of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives by Executive Order, just days after President Bush's inauguration, there have been two Directors: John J. Dilulio, Jr. and Jim Towey. In a speech delivered in early 2002, Bush mentions Jim Towey who works in the “Faith-Based Office.” The mention of the “Community” component of that office is curiously absent. This is an example of how the emphasis of the office is on faith—simple community efforts are indeed mentioned in the sample, but not nearly as frequently as decidedly religious outfits. In fact, Bush often leaves out the “community” component of the Faith-Based and *Community* Initiatives program. For example, he explains to an audience that he “reached into

Philadelphia to ask a man to run the office of the Faith-Based Initiative” (2001m). Again, in 2004, he makes the same sort of reference, failing to include the community portion of the office: “You see, I set up a faith-based office in the White House. You’re about to hear from Jim Towey who’s the—runs the faith-based office” (2004h). Bush says that Towey’s “job is to work with the faith community to make America a better place” (2002h). Here Bush confirms that his reference to a “Faith-Based Office” is no mere slip of the tongue, no inadvertent abbreviation. Towey’s job is quite explicit: it is to work with “the faith community.” Bush’s remarks plainly disclose the collaborative relationship between government and faith-based organizations. This is yet another indicator of Bush’s breaching the contract term of maintaining the guise of separation between church and state.

As the president traveled the country promoting the initiative during his first term, he used his speeches to promote the unification and partnership of government and faith-based charities to help the populace in need. President Bush remarks frequently on the partnership of the two entities. For example, in a speech to members of the Southern Baptist Convention, Bush said: “We believe that our government should view the good people who work in faith-based charities as partners, not rivals” (2002k). His use of the term “rivals” indicates that there was some amount of perceived ill will between federal and faith-based organizations in the past. By articulating his point in this manner, Bush appeals to the audiences’ feelings, establishes himself as one of them (“we”), and portrays himself and his program as a remedy for this rivalry. Under his direction, however, a “partnership” shall be instated. In a conference about the initiative, Bush pledges: “we want more and more faith-based charities to become partners in our efforts, our unyielding efforts to change America one heart, on conscience, one soul at a time” (2002c). Partnership between the federal government and the various faith-based organizations, encouraged so enthusiastically by

the president, serves to breach the provision of Hart's contract that the guise of separation between government and organized religion must be maintained. Furthermore, consider the fact that the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives works with a designated person or team in each of President Bush's Cabinet offices, per Bush's design.

In addition to the office created expressly for the purpose of facilitating relations between persons in the faith community and the federal government, Bush also acknowledges the support of key figures in his administration for the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives:

I know you've heard from some of my key Cabinet secretaries. Within their secretariat are offices designed to speak up for, defend, and empower faith-based groups, specially created within the bureaucracy.

Look, I fully understand the issue, the frustration some face. And it's a frustration based upon a long practice here at the federal level, and that is there's no place for faith-based programs and trying to help people in need. And therefore, we'll discriminate, shove out of the way, not deal with, make it hard for, create barriers to entry. And my administration is absolutely committed to reducing those barriers to entry. And we've created these offices whose sole function it is to, one, recognize the power of faith and, two, recognize there are fantastic programs all throughout the country on a variety of subjects, all based upon faith, all changing lives, all making American life better, and therefore, folks would be enlisted in making sure the American dream extends throughout our society. (2003c)

This one quotation reveals key features of Bush's breach of contract in clearly articulating his ideal: cooperation between sacred and secular concerns in the distribution of social services. In

particular, he uses the concepts of partnership and past discrimination to advance his plan for the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, as well as the services it will provide. Most importantly perhaps, Bush makes reference to “Cabinet secretaries,” people in positions of power who will, under his direction and by his mandate, work closely with organizations of faith to distribute funds meant to assist pained individuals. President Bush mentions that the “sole purpose” of some of these individuals is to “recognize the power of faith” and that fine programs are “based upon faith.” Bush personally believes in the power of these programs and has established government bodies to support and fund them.

President Bush goes on to detail his plans to direct the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Housing and Urban Development agency, and the Health and Human Services agency not only to fund faith-based initiatives, but also to “revise their regulations to reflect the principle of nondiscrimination” (2002c). In fact, President Bush penned another Executive Order to supplement the one creating the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. This Executive Order, 13198, is entitled “Agency Responsibilities with Respect to Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.”¹⁹ The critical point of this order is that it mandates government involvement and cooperation with faith-based organizations, run by an organized religion. In fact, there is an entire document written for faith-based organizations detailing precisely how to work with government. This document, entitled Guidance to Faith-Based and Community Organizations on Partnering with the Federal Government, contains the following telling preamble:

The guiding principle behind President Bush’s Faith-Based and Community Initiative is that *faith-based charities* should be able to

¹⁹ For the full text of that Order, please refer to “Appendix B: Executive Order 13198” on page 216.

compete on an equal footing for public dollars to provide public services.

President Bush believes that the Federal government, within the framework of Constitutional church-state guidelines, should encourage *faith-based charities* to reach out with compassion to help even more people in need.

(Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives 3, emphasis added)

Note that there are two references to the faith-based charities, and, aside from the title of the initiative, no reference to community charities. This overshadows the oblique reference to “Constitutional church-state guidelines.” In terms of his addresses regarding the faith-based and community initiative, there is a similar pattern. For example, in a 2003 speech to urban leaders, President Bush remarked that: “The government, as it gives support, as it provides help to the faith-based program and in return asks for help for solving social problems, as it does that it should never discriminate. It should never cause the faith-based program to lose its character or to compromise the mission” (2003c). This quotation reveals the reciprocal partnership between faith-based programs and government: in return for funds, government expects faith-based problem solving techniques to “solve” social problems. In fact, states Bush “Our government should not fear faith, we ought to welcome it as an equal partner in helping people who need help” (2003a). In a similar statement, he says: “This is a time when you’re going to find, I believe, in American history where our government, instead of fearing faith and faith-based programs, welcomes faith and faith-based programs in to the compassionate delivery [of help]” (2002g). At another event, Bush says: “I believe one of the most effective ways our government can help those in need is to help the charities and community groups that are doing God’s work every day. That’s what I believe government ought to do. I believe government needs to stand on the side of faith-based groups, not against faith-based groups, when they come to saving lives” (2004e).

Government and the faith-based groups are standing on the same “side,” partners in the plan to remedy social ills. Hart’s rhetorical contract asserts that the guise of separation between these two bodies must be maintained, and that “both of the contracting parties willingly agree to maintain the fiction of separation” (Hart, Pulpit 54). Instead, Bush’s program encourages involvement between the two. In fact, the Office even hosts seminars to instruct participants in the ways to apply for funding.

With his initiative established, President Bush needs to spread the word about the funding available to the groups that might benefit and thus serve afflicted people. In his 16 July 2006 speech delivered to urban leaders regarding the faith-based initiative, President Bush mentions a set of conferences designed to instruct faith-based and community groups precisely how to seek federal funds for their programs:

So one of the things we’ve done here in the White House to deal with this issue is we’ve started—and Jim Towey is—we’ve got an office dedicated, by the way, to this faith-based initiative. And we’ve started White House conferences to explain to people how the process works. . . . These are the different pots of money, if you will, that are accessible to the faith community so that you can help fund the programs. (2003c)

President Bush goes on to explain that while the courses are designed to help the organizations get funding, he also acknowledges that, in the past, such grant requests would often “fall on deaf ears” (2003c). Bush tells his listeners that they should attend conferences where government representatives of the initiative “try to describe how to access a system” for securing funds (2003c). Bush reassures his audience as follows: “we’re also changing habits here in Washington, D.C. And that’s what the office of the—the office within these departments are all designed to do,

to facilitate, to make it easier for people to access, to make sure that we really do tap the heart and soul of our country” (2003c). The incentive for those in the audience to participate was great. President Bush told his assembled audience that there would be “six-hundred-million dollars over three years” if his proposal was passed by Congress (2003c).

In many of the sampled speeches, President Bush mentions specific charities that have already benefitted from the program, as well as the government offices they tapped for resources including the Department of Education, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Labor.²⁰ The significance of the involvement of all of Bush’s Cabinet agencies is that it is another example of the breach of contract regarding the guise of separation between church and government. Bush’s aim is to change the government, as he freely admits.

The guise of separation further is challenged by Bush’s self-proclaimed plan to change the “culture” of government even though “It takes awhile, but we’re working on it” (2003f). For example, Bush asserts the following:

And so here we are at the Conference on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. That’s a pretty fancy word for our government trying to tell you that we’re trying to change the culture in Washington, D.C.—(applause)—to welcome people of faith in helping meet social objectives. That’s what this means. That’s a long title for: The hope and healing of faith-based services are an integral part of working together to make America a more

²⁰ The charities President Bush names in this exchange include St. Stephen’s Community House in Columbus, Ohio; The Frederick Douglas Community Development Corporation and the Memorial AME Zion Church in Rochester, New York; Operation New Hope, City Center Ministries, and the Exodus Transitional Community in Jacksonville, Florida.

hopeful place for all. And it is essential for those of us in government to recognize the vital work that faith-based programs are able to do. (2004h)

President Bush goes on to say that those people running the faith-based organizations may rightly be cautious about working with government, but again, “What we’re working on is to change the culture, to recognize that there are results, fantastic results being achieved; and that those of us who are policymakers [sic] must welcome those who are achieving the good results of the work of faith” (2004h). Bush believes that such programs are “so effective that it points to a new role for government, a new political philosophy” (2003f). President Bush articulates this new philosophy during each faith-based event he attends.

With addresses and visits from President Bush, one key office and several satellite offices dedicated to the faith-based initiative, and conferences designed to inform people about the means of accessing federal funds, the pending change in the culture of the government is all but assured. President Bush discusses his initiative with great enthusiasm and obvious determination, thus reassuring those many people and the organizations they represent within his audiences looking for federal funding. Bush says:

Neighborhood healers have not been treated well by the federal government, so I signed an executive order banning discrimination against faith-based charities by federal agencies. I created a special offices [sic] in my key Cabinet departments to speak up for faith-based groups, and to help them access government funding I’ve asked the departments to report to me on a regular basis to make sure the old days are gone, to make sure we challenge and harness the great strength of the country, the heart and soul of our citizens. We’re changing the focus of government from process to

results. Instead of asking the question, is this a faith-based program? We're now asking the question, does the program work? And if so, it deserves our support. (2003a)

This one quotation neatly sums up the elements of Bush's breach of the rhetorical contract term whereby the guise of separation between government and organized religion must be maintained. He uses discrimination as one reason for the exclusion of faith-based organizations in the past and refers to his establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives by Executive Order. He furthermore notes the role of his Cabinet offices in the execution of his initiative. President Bush's mentioning the changing nature of government's focus and the pending support further demonstrates a break with the tradition of maintaining the guise of separation between organized religion and government. Another important factor of the rhetorical contract entails maintaining a similar guise of existential equality between government and organized religion.

The Guise of Existential Equality

When Hart wrote the rhetorical contract, he envisioned another guise that should be upheld by the parties in the contract: that of existential equality. Hart says that this contractual element means that "The church's realm is clearly the rhetorical—*it can make words about social conditions and governmental priorities but it cannot enforce its will directly and immediately as can government*" (Pulpit 57, emphasis added). Church and government are not, in Hart's contractual conception, equal. Maintaining the guise means upholding the appearance that religion and government are equal in addressing "social conditions." My analysis reveals that, while Bush does not violate this component of the rhetorical contract in the way Hart expects, where he would make it obvious that the church's power is only rhetorical, Bush still violates this

contractual element. President Bush does so by emphasizing his opinion that religious organizations are *better* able to address poor social conditions than government.

President Bush often points to what government cannot do as a means both to justify and to advance his faith-based initiative. The following quotation is highly representative of these themes abundantly found throughout this sample. Bush says: “*government cannot put hope in people’s hearts. It cannot put faith in people’s lives.* And faith is a powerful—faith is a powerful motivator. Many a program relies upon faith, and we ought to welcome the faith-based programs into the compassionate delivery of help” (2002i, emphasis added). Again and again, Bush tells his audience that there are things the government just cannot do.²¹ Government is incapable of reaching people, says Bush, on a deep personal level: “Love is powerful. Love is soul-changing. Love doesn’t happen because of government; love happens because of the inspiration of something greater than government. That’s what we’re here to talk about—programs based upon faith” (15 January 2004). Again, Bush establishes the hierarchy: religion trumps government.

The guise of equality is further demolished when Bush lauds the progress of the faith-based community and government’s obligation to assist in those efforts. For example, in a speech about welfare reform, Bush says: “Faith-based groups are reclaiming America, block by block, life by life, from the inside out. We must encourage their work, without undermining their freedom or their identity or their purpose” (2002a).

Money alone, Bush says, is not enough. He uses the welfare system as an example, saying: “We just reformed our welfare in America and we’ve helped a lot of people. Yet, even as we work

²¹ Following are a few quotations illustrative of this tendency: “what government cannot do is put hope in people’s hearts” (2002g), “this [inventing a community program] is something government can’t start” (2002a), “government cannot put hope in a person’s heart of a sense of purpose in a person’s life” (2004j), “Government is not very good about changing hearts, see. Government is law and justice; government isn’t love” (2004j), “what government cannot do is put hope in people’s hearts or a sense of purpose in people’s lives” (2001o), and “government cannot make people love one another” (2001p).

to improve the welfare laws, we know that welfare policy [a government program] will not solve the deepest problems of the spirit” (2003b). For those problems, Bush asserts, organizations recognized as faith-based are essential. In fact, claims Bush, government often stands in the way of the faith community’s tending to social problems: “And the fundamental question in our society is, how does the federal government relate to programs of faith. ‘The mighty check writer’—how does it relate when it writes checks to meet social needs with people who are solving our problems, *in spite of government?*” (2004g, emphasis added). Presenting government as a barrier to faith-based social works does not promote the guise of equality.

Perhaps more important to the breach of this element of the contract is the likelihood that representatives of organized religion, in petitioning the federal government for funding, actually do exert more than a rhetorical force upon government dealings—they are partners in creating and enacting some social service policy that results in material gain. President Bush routinely violates this portion of the contract with examples of how people, frequently present in the audience he is addressing, have gained materially from faith-based programs funded by the federal government. For example, President Bush frequently mentions the charity Habitat for Humanity in this sample.²² Habitat describes itself as an “*ecumenical Christian* housing ministry” (Habitat for Humanity “Fact Sheet,” emphasis added), so while the organization certainly does great work in various communities, it is still a religious institution. Religious institutions, per the contract, are only supposed to have rhetorical power in the context of social affairs; however, the construction and disbursement of an actual home is clearly not just a rhetorical act. Bush pledges to give more money to faith-based services to fund future acts of material compassion. Bush remarks:

²² Bush makes an appearance at a Habitat for Humanity event, or mentions Habitat four times in this sample. Only one other organization receives that many nods. See “Appendix E: Organizations Mentioned in Sample” on page 230 for a list of organizations mentioned by President Bush.

Oh, there are some in our society who are skeptical about funding faith. I hear it all the time in the halls of Congress—we can't fund faith-based organizations. If that's the case, are they willing to eliminate the line item for programs such as Habitat for Humanity in the budget? I say they shouldn't. As a matter of fact, I'm submitting a budget next year that triples the amount of money available for programs such as Habitat for Humanity. (2001)

President Bush uses the success of Habitat as rhetorical leverage to justify his program as well as to serve as a jab at Congress.

The faith-based community is providing more than words of comfort and is acting in a capacity beyond its rhetorical limit imposed by the existential equality portion of the rhetorical contract due to the Bush faith-based policy. Instead, with government funding, faith-based organizations are providing the monetary means of comfort to afflicted Americans, just as some government programs are meant to do. Should those organizations also be committed to ministering and proselytizing to those people they help, therein lies a problem.²³ Bush addresses that issue in the following series of quotations that are typical of his remarks:

[M]y pledge to the faith-based community in America is my administration will do everything in our power to make sure that those who do interface with government never have to sacrifice their mission, their reason for being—because, again, I understand the power of faith and the hope faith brings all across the country. (2001o)

²³ In 2006, the United States Government Accountability Office produced a document entitled “Faith-Based and Community Initiative: Improvements in Monitoring Grantees and Measuring Performance Could Enhance Accountability” that provides information about some of the organizations surveyed by the GAO to determine their conformance to policy provisions.

But governments can and should support effective social services provided by religious people, so long as they work and as long as those services go to anyone in need, regardless of their faith. And when government gives that support, it is equally important that faith-based institutions should not be forced to change the character or compromise their prophetic role. (2003b)

Well, how can you be a faith-based program if you can't practice your faith? All of a sudden, you become just another program. (2004d)

[H]ow can you be a faith-based program if you can't practice your faith? It seems to be a contradiction in terms. (2004g)

We're also making sure that our bureaucracies don't say to faith-based groups, you can't be a faith-based group. If faith is part of being an effective program, it doesn't make sense to say to somebody, you can't practice your faith. (2004k)

In a 2002 address, Bush lauds a program's success in helping people in Washington, D.C. communities, and then goes on to say: "There's [sic] bible [sic] studies here" (2002a). How can character be divorced from action? How can an organization helping a person with his present problems not prophecy about its version of the future and what that might hold? With this, the issue is resolved: organizations do not need to change their mission or mandates to participate in the faith-based program. President Bush welcomes their active participation.

Overly Religious Language

The third element of Hart’s rhetorical contract stipulates that presidents must not use “overly” religious language in their address, and that organized religion must similarly refrain from using decidedly political language. Hart writes that

With the twin proposition that the ‘First party (government) rhetoric will refrain from being overly religious and second party (religion) rhetoric will refrain from being overly political,’ we come upon the most important feature of the contract I have been describing [“maintaining rhetorical balance”] . . . Most governmental spokesmen [sic] and religious leaders attempt a rhetorical juggling act when dealing with politically tinged religious issues or with affairs of state bordering on the theological. The rhetorical ideal, of course is to maintain the hyphen in civil-religious matters. (Pulpit 61)

Hart defines rhetorical balance as the most important part of the rhetorical contract. The first two provisions of the contract maintain the balance of perceived separation and equality between organized religion and government—largely accomplished through the president’s appropriate language. This element, of course, deals with religious language. Hart says that the two parties to the rhetorical contract must be mindful of the content of the messages they convey. That is, government messages should not contain denominational elements; religious messages should not contain political elements. While Hart does acknowledge that the president is often expected to use religious language, the key is the balance of the sacred and secular.

My analysis of Bush’s speeches regarding the faith-based initiative reveals many religious overtones—even in addresses given to supposedly secular groups—and quotations from

Scripture. A key component to the religious language element for my analysis deals with the means to which religious language is put. That is, is religious language used as a means to justify or support government policy, which would be inappropriate, or is it used as a means of assurance and support, which would be consistent with traditional applications of civil religion.

During an address to the Conference of Mayors in Detroit, President Bush lauded many faith-based programs for their contributions to poor and troubled people, saying that surely opponents of his faith-based initiative would not want to end such programs and the good they do simply because of their religious nature (2001n). The speech proceeds with a fairly secular tone until his closing remarks:

America can be saved, one heart, one soul, one conscience at a time. The pastor of Rosedale, Dennis Talbert is fond of quoting a passage from the Book of Romans: When I want to do good, evil is right there with me. That accurately describes the situation of many of our children in America. Evil is what his church is fighting against, with impressive results. And it's worth noting that Rosedale's outreach programs are financially supported by the Department of Justice and Michigan's Family Independence Agency, among others, and it shows what is possible. (2001n)

Within the context of the charity he is lauding, a Baptist church, paraphrasing from the Bible is certainly acceptable; however, the religious reference—however oblique—at a secular event is telling. It reveals that, regardless of context, President Bush is comfortable inserting religious language into his rhetorical execution of civil religion. This is important because it indicates Bush's disregard for situationally appropriate language. The mayors in his audience are from across the nation and not necessarily part of the Republican party. More importantly, President

Bush cannot assume that everybody in the audience is a Christian, let alone an evangelical Christian. Furthermore, note the government organizations he mentions in the funding of the program he celebrates.

When his audience is composed of decidedly religious people, President Bush speaks like a seasoned preacher. For example, in an address to religious broadcasters Bush remarks:

It's been said that 11:00 a.m. on Sunday is the most segregated hour in America. We all have a responsibility to break down the barriers that divide us. In Scripture, God commands us to reach out to those who are different, to reconcile with each other, to lay down our lives in service to others. And He promises that the fruits of faith and fellowship, service and reconciliation will far surpass the struggles we go through to achieve them.

(2003b)

This quotation shows Bush's tendency to use religious belief as a means to change social conditions, particularly ones that "divide" the "rich and poor, alike; suburban church and urban church" (2003b). Ironically, it is just such language and resultant policy that divides the nation Bush seeks to unite with religious language in general and religious teachings specifically. Additionally, his mention of God in this context is not in accordance with traditional civil religious mentions of God. That is, such invocations are usually reserved for introductory and closing remarks, in times of crisis (Beasley, You 4; Hart, Pulpit 47), or in decidedly ceremonial events such as Independence Day celebrations. In Bush's address, however, this paragraph is nestled comfortably within the body of the speech. More important than position, however, is the fact that Bush promotes religious belief as a means for social action.

In another example of inappropriate language, Bush uses biblical lessons as a means to prod people to social action. In at least two instances in this sample, Bush turns to justifications of faith for humanitarian aid that needs no such justification, particularly from a compassionate country. In an address regarding the AIDS crisis, for example, Bush remarks:

Every man and woman and child who suffers from this affliction, from the streets of Philly to the villages of Africa, is a child of God who deserves our love and our help. And that's what I'm here to talk about today. We're provided—we're determined to provide that help. We're committed to help those at home and help those abroad. To whom much has been given, much is demanded. (2004c)

The key to coercion in that quotation resides in the last sentence, which is a paraphrase of a verse from Luke. In that same speech Bush also makes reference to “a Lazarus effect” when patients get the new AIDS drugs. Bush continues, stating that “we're helping other nations to buy drugs . . . so that we can extend lives. Because, you see, every life matters to the Author of life, and so they matter to us” (2004c). This quotation uses “the Author of life” as a means to justify and sanction policy. In this instance, it is certainly a good policy, but the application of the religious language and the reason behind it are troubling. Bush is using what he divines to be God's position to justify what is already right. In another unique address regarding human trafficking, Bush explains that: “Human life is the gift of our Creator—and it should never be for sale” (2004b). Bush's invoking God to justify a policy that needs no justification, like the AIDS situation above, is curious and questionable.

President Bush also uses key phrases and concepts likely known to members of the religious community to communicate religiously infused concepts. Some examples from this

sample include: the ideals of the Declaration “are the mighty rock on which we have built our nation” (2001j), a reference to Psalm 18; “True faith is never isolated from the rest of life, and faith without works is dead” (2002k), likely a reference to James; “We want you to follow the word” (2002c), likely a reference to 2 Chronicles; “Nothing [is] more hopeful than the Word” (2004g); and “I’m honored to be with so many of you all who have dedicated your lives to sharing the good news” (2003b), perhaps a reference to Luke (BibleGateway, Bible Tools). “Faith” and “works,” the “Word,” and the “good news” are all phrases common to the faithful believers Bush often addresses in this sample of first-term speeches regarding the faith-based initiative.

Even members of the president’s administration are able to communicate in a way that conveys deep religious conviction. Bush speaks for them as well: “the men up here [urban leaders involved in the faith-based initiative] represent a representative sample of what we call the faith community in America. People who first and foremost have been called because of a calling much higher than government” (2003c). The “higher calling,” presumably, is that issued by God.

Regardless of context and audience, President Bush apparently has no apprehension in using religious language, veiled and plain, to communicate his feelings, goals, and the plans and events attributed to the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. While his religious speech and Biblical references are certainly eloquent, they are also at times simultaneously inappropriate for the context and audience at hand. Passages quoted from the Bible, though frequent among presidents, are also questionable in the context of his speeches in that he is the nation’s secular official, not a religious figurehead. Combined with the previous two breached contractual elements, the breakage of contract is further affirmed in his language. In the next section, I examine the fourth and final element, which is that the government official should not reveal the contract terms to the general public.

Revelation of the Contract Terms

The final component of Hart's contract is that the parties should not make the contractual terms known to the public. What Hart intended was that the government official should maintain the rhetorical balance whereby he sounds as though his actions and language are religiously inspired, yet he is actually acting in a secular capacity. President Bush violates this element of the rhetorical contract by emphasizing the role of religion in what is supposed to be a secular administration. This is exacerbated by Bush's consistency in revealing to the public the extent of the cooperation between government and organized religion. Bush's regular acknowledgement of the successful implementation of his faith-based plan and all the documented events surrounding the plan violates this portion of the contract. That violation is most evident in the activities of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and the Cabinet officials charged with assisting that Office. While Bush affirms that, per law, the two types of organizations must remain separate, his obvious intention is to wed them anyway. This may be demonstrated in the following quotation from an address President Bush delivered to Hispanic faith-based organizations. He says that prayer:

reminds me about what government ought to do. We ought to set money out there to encourage faith-based initiatives.

At the same time, we must never be so arrogant as to say, you can't fulfill your mission if you access federal money, therefore, you have to change the entire mission of why you exist. I understand the frustrations with some in the faith-based community, and the nervousness as they approach the issue. They say to themselves, why would I want to access federal money if the federal government then tries to take away my

mission, to take the cross off the wall or the Star of David off the wall.

Why would I want to interface with a government that's going to say, we'll reluctantly give you money, and then force you to change your calling.

Well, I can understand that. And one of our commitments is that we will work tirelessly to make sure that bureaucracies don't stifle the very reason you exist in the first place, and the power of your ministries, which is faith—which is faith. (2001m)

The beginning of this quotation is critical. By revealing that prayer “reminds [him] about what government should do,” Bush is saying that God is using the vehicle of prayer to tell government what its activities ought to be. Government, receiving instructions through Bush's prayer, is thus made subordinate to the religious conviction that guides it. Also, president Bush acknowledges the tendency of the government to attempt to stifle the missions of faith-based organizations in order to receive federal funds. To comply, many such organizations feel that they must change or downplay their calling. He acknowledges the difficulties in previous dealings between government and faith-based organizations and then affirms that such discrimination will no longer be tolerated. This message, presumably, is then communicated through the agencies receiving monies to the recipients who benefit from the services, thus revealing the terms of the contract. President Bush vows that: “Together, we're going to put the federal government and local government squarely on the side of America's armies of compassion” (2001n). Without the threat of having to change their missions, faith-based organizations would likely seek to partner with government. These partnerships are lauded in each speech President Bush delivers regarding the faith-based initiative, and they are numerous.²⁴

Again, consider the fact that President Bush set up not just the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, but also such offices in each of his Cabinets to secure the future of this plan by two separate executive orders. Organizations receive funding via the Office and successful results are announced to the public as a means to increase support for the measure overall. The relationship between the two is one of cordial partnership:

I've got offices in each Cabinet set up to make sure that the faith-based programs have a friendly ear when they come to apply; that they're not facing the same old bureaucratic morass, that they get a welcoming ear. Rod has got one in his office. HUD has got one. Social—cabinets have got them in their offices, because I want people who have got a good idea about how to change somebody's life to have a sympathetic ear in Washington, D.C. (2003e)

Not only will religious programs find a sympathetic ear in government, they will also get access to taxpayer money, as President Bush asserts. He says: "I am not the least bit hesitant to encourage our government to use federal tax money to rally the armies of compassion which exist in every society in America" (2003d). Of course, Bush recognizes that such measures may be met with some protest as:

there's been a big debate about this, of course, because we want to make sure there's a separation of church and state—the state should never be the church and the church should never be the state. That's clear. That's clear. But if we have a social objective and you've got people of faith helping

²⁴ For a list of specific organizations mentioned by President Bush in his first-term rhetoric regarding the faith-based and community initiative, please refer to "Appendix E: Organizations Mentioned in Sample" on page 230.

achieve that objective, doesn't it make sense for the government to not fear faith, but to welcome faith in meeting common goals? (2004h)

By acknowledging church and state separation and then going on to assert that government and faith ought to work together anyway, Bush is revealing a new relationship between government and organized religion. The two will work together in a clandestine fashion, which is in accordance with the contract terms, but he violates the contract by making that relationship known. President Bush openly and repeatedly encourages the cooperation of government and organized religion in the execution of his initiative. Again, recall that a theme related to the guise of separation is that Bush's aim is to change the existing philosophy and culture of government.

Based on this sample of Bush's first-term rhetoric regarding his plans for and the activities of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, he can be said to have violated the rhetorical contract Hart proposed between government, personified by the president, and organized religion. Bush fails to maintain the guise of separation and the guise of equality between the two entities. He uses religious language inappropriate for a secular official. Furthermore, he makes the relationship between the two parties known to the general public with his myriad appearances and speeches on the subject.

In his discussion of the rhetorical contract between government and organized religion, Hart makes it clear that the agreement between the two is very "practical" (Pulpit, 46). The two parties readily recognize and openly acknowledge that religious teachings have a profound "stabilizing effect" on "public messages" and the public hearing those messages (Hart, Pulpit, 46). In President Bush's application of the rhetorical contract, the relationship is not simply "practical." Rather, the relationship is based on ideological belief. This instance of Bush's unique

application of pastoral power, whereby a government official uses religious tenets in an attempt to control the constituency, takes on a more sinister feel given Hart's assessment.

President Bush's Brand of New Pastoral Power

Bush is openly enthusiastic about the role of religion in general and religious organizations in particular in correcting problems the American public faces. He repeatedly asserts that government cannot do what religion is capable of doing to remedy many social ills. In and of itself, this notion may not be problematic for some. However, when such an attitude is espoused by a secular official, particularly the president as the leader of the American public, it becomes problematic and potentially divisive.

Such a reliance on religion as a means of control and resolution of public problems has characteristics of church coercion that Foucault describes as old pastoral power. Bush melds the religious overtones of old pastoral power with the characteristics of the new pastoral power to create a hybridized type of pastoral power that is unique to him. The characteristics of new pastoral power are three in number: an assurance of individual salvation in this world, an increase in the number of people capable of administering pastoral power, and an intricate knowledge of the individual and community.

Combined, the elements of Bush's brand of new pastoral power serve to control the American public in a way that government involvement alone cannot. That is, pastoral power techniques provide a more direct pipeline to an individual's innermost and core beliefs. As evidenced by President Bush's rhetoric in this sample, he has implemented—or is in the process of implementing—each aspect of religion-infused new pastoral power with the end of furthering a religious agenda on a national scale. This agenda, to the degree that members of the public find it objectionable, is a divisive force in the functioning of American society as a whole.

Assurance of Salvation in this World

The first trait of the new pastoral power has to do with salvation. Whereas religion is generally viewed as a means to secure salvation in the afterlife, in the realm of pastoral power, salvation is focused exclusively on salvation in this, earth-bound world. To secure the earthly salvation, which deals with health, well being, security, and so on, Bush seeks to save the soul—a nod to the “old” pastoral power detailed by Foucault. That is, organizations supported by the faith-based initiative save souls in the process of administering their help and care. In his speeches regarding the faith-based initiative, President Bush makes repeated reference to how federally funded religious (and community) groups may save the troubled person and lead him or her to a better life. Bush is committed to the initiative, stating that: “Ours is an administration that will deal with the problems of the day” (2001p). To deal with those problems, says Bush, his administration will rely on the daily works of the soldiers in the armies of compassion—much as his father proposed cooperation with charitable organizations he described as “a thousand points of light in a broad and peaceful sky” in his acceptance speech as the Republican candidate for president in 1988 (George H. W. Bush “Acceptance”).

In implementing the new pastoral power element that aims to assure salvation in this earth-bound world, President Bush frequently mentions the saving of souls in America, often one at a time. Soul saving is part and parcel of Bush’s distributing of salvation in this world. The material services offered by the faith-based community take care of the rest. Consider the following quotations where President Bush mentions his grave concern with souls and the saving of souls and lives as being of primary concern to the faith-based initiative in particular and his administration in general:

America's society will change one heart, one soul, one conscience at a time. And each of us must do our part to provide hope for that soul and that conscience. (2001o)

[C]ommunity programs . . . change America one person, one soul, on conscience at a time. (2002g)

Your compassion is saving lives. Your country is grateful. Thank you for what you do. (2003d)

[The director of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives] understands there are things more important than political parties. And one of those things more important than political parties is to help heal the nation's soul. (2002f)

Problems that face our society are oftentimes problems that require something greater than just a government program or a government counselor to solve. Intractable problems, problems that seem impossible to solve can be solved. There is the miracle of salvation in our—that is real, that is tangible, that is available for all to see. Miracles are possible in our society, one person at a time. (2004g)

[T]hose of us who have been blessed with the opportunity to help must play to the strength of our country in order to help save lives. (2004g)

[H]ow do we make sure America is as hopeful a place it can possibly be, one soul at a time, one conscience at a time. (2004j)

The preceding quotations are prime examples of Bush's insistence on saving the soul of the nation one person at a time. This is a key element to his unique implementation of new pastoral power—

the literal soul and life saving that comes about when people go to faith-based organizations for earthly salvation, which entails the essentials of a happy and healthy life.

To support his personal implementation of new pastoral power and the saving of souls through the faith-based initiative, President Bush repeatedly asserts that those who are against his program should focus on results and not process. This theme is rampant throughout the sample. Results, such as a successfully rehabilitated alcoholic, matter most. If it takes federally funded religious programs to do so, then President Bush finds that acceptable. After all, “what matters is whether or not lives are being saved” (2004j). Bush praises the good souls embodying compassion saying that it must be very rewarding “Saving America, one soul at a time” (2004j). Organizations ministering to a person’s basic material needs—for housing, child care, counseling, and so on—naturally entails attention to a person’s “foundation.” With Bush’s insistence that organizations receiving funds not be forced to change their missions or to not practice their faith, the foundations of the people they help are affected by default. For example, Bush made the following statement to the assembled members of the National Governors Association:

And finally, the faith-based initiative—I want to talk a little bit about that. My attitude is, if a program works, let’s use it. If a program can help save somebody’s life, it seems like to me that program ought to be allowed to access monies aimed at helping people help themselves. And yet, that’s not the way it was here in Washington. Faith-based programs were discriminated against. There was a process argument. And governors are results-oriented people, and so am I. And it seems like to me, you ought have the flexibility, and people at your grass-roots level ought to have the

flexibility to access taxpayers' money if they're able to meet common objectives. (2004k)

“Common objectives” in this case would be the distribution of that salvation that gives people basic human comfort in this life. President Bush glosses over the process part, focusing on results, but it is precisely the process that matters. Bush knows better than most, due to his own experiences in fighting alcoholism, that the process entails “changing a heart” on the way to escaping one’s personal hell and again enjoying the good things in life.

This aspect of Bush’s new pastoral power deals with the promise of good things in this life, and that is manifested in Bush’s rhetoric by his repeated insistence that faith-based programs, funded by government, are indispensable in working life-saving miracles on a daily basis:

You see, every day across America, faith-based and community groups are touching people’s lives in profound ways—give shelter to the homeless and provide safety for battered women; they bring compassion to lonely seniors. America’s neighborhood healers have long experience and deep understanding of the problems that many face. And many of them have something extra besides experience. They have inspiration, as they carry God’s love to people in need. (2003a)

President Bush often cites examples of people who have been helped by participants in his initiative. For example, a homeless mother’s “story is one that shows that individual lives are rescued on a daily basis” by faith-based organizations funded with taxpayer dollars. Bush also illustrates this daily wonder with reference to various people who had different problems and who were helped with faith-based programs, such as when he participates in Habitat for Humanity

events. People who have been helped are also frequently present in his more formal appearances—living testimonies to the success of Bush’s initiative.

Keys to success are funding, partnership, and cooperation between government and organized religious groups in creating “programs that save Americans, one soul at a time” (2004g). Again, it is critical to the execution of Bush’s faith-based plan that the organizations providing for troubled Americans not be forced to change their mission, and, therefore, in some cases, soul saving is a necessary component in securing a better life. In sum, says President Bush, “If a program can help save somebody’s life, it seems like to me that program ought to be allowed to access monies aimed at helping people help themselves” (2004k). Bush’s plan ensures that government is also involved in these daily miracles: “Many are called by God to [help afflicted people], and government must stand on the side of those millions of acts of mercy and kindness that take place on a daily basis” (2004e). The money dispersed is plentiful, as Bush says that “we’ve had over a billion dollars go out the door to faith-based programs, programs all aimed at serving America by saving lives. (Applause.) And it makes sense. It just makes sense” (2004f). Bush’s contention that the program “serves America” is a justification for using taxpayer dollars to fund religious organizations so that they can save souls and offer the salvation that leads to a better life here and now. The people given credit for saving lives are those soldiers in the armies of compassion and social entrepreneurs who, with government, will “do everything in our power to save America one soul at a time” (Bush 2004f). The saving of souls and lives is the definitive business of faithful persons, and therefore Bush naturally wants “people of faith involved in solving peoples lives” (2004d). With the help of government in the form of funding, many variously afflicted people can find both spiritual and material salvation through faith-based organizations.

In this sample, there are many, many references to soldiers in the armies of compassion and social entrepreneurs. President Bush's document proposing the establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives is entitled "Rallying the Armies of Compassion." It is a consistent theme used in conjunction with the mission of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives since Bush first started speaking about it. President Bush repeatedly lauds the soldiers in the armies of compassion and the social entrepreneurs. These individuals put the federal monies to work in programs designed to uplift the American in need. Bush speaks to members of participating organizations, such as the Youth Entertainment Academy (2001p) and the Power Center in Houston (2003e) quite frequently and praises their remarkable efforts. President Bush simultaneously praises and encourages the people who are saving those in need, saying: "This country is blessed with virtually millions of good-hearted volunteers who work daily miracles in the lives of their fellow citizens. And today I ask our religious broadcasters, those who reach into every corner of America, to rally the armies of compassion so that we can change America one heart, one soul at a time" (2003b). This quotation shows that Bush is keenly aware of the power of the religious broadcasting community to "reach into every corner of America" to recruit more volunteers to perform such "daily miracles." His is truly a nation-wide plan, and Bush relies on the instruments at hand, such as the religious broadcasters, to implement that plan. The emphasis is on the works of individuals contributing to the resolution of the issues of the day. Bush believes that: "while one person can't do everything, one person can do something to make our society a more compassionate and decent place" (2003b).

Ensuring salvation in this world means that social conditions must be improved for "the least of these," a Biblical reference to Matthew (BibleGateway) alluding to the less fortunate in the American public. To help all of these pained individuals in their daily struggles, there must be

more people to provide services, which leads to the second aspect of new pastoral power: the propensity to increase the numbers of those to provide services.

Plans to Increase Agents of Pastoral Power

The establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives is a prime example of the means by which Bush's Christianized brand of new pastoral power techniques may add to the numbers of people who provide services to and minister to the population. In Foucault's treatment of this aspect of pastoral power, he says that "sometimes this form of power was exerted by state apparatus or . . . a public institution" ("Subject," 215). Also, writes Foucault, "Sometimes the power was exercised by private ventures, welfare societies, benefactors, and generally by philanthropists" ("Subject," 215). In the case of Bush's faith-based initiative, most of the organizations fall into the second category, though he does mention a few federal programs in the sample. Many of the programs he uses as examples are, in fact, Christian organizations.

President Bush says that "there is no more important initiative than the faith-based program" (2001c). In the early years of his administration and before the Iraq war began, Bush made many appearances to promote his faith-based initiative. For example, the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives identified twenty-two events in 2001 compared with six events in 2003 regarding Bush's initiative (Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, "President Bush's Speeches on FBCI"). During those appearances, Bush frequently mentions organizations working with the government.²⁵ Furthermore, Bush emphasizes the government's role is "to encourage the development and expansion of faith-based programs throughout the country" (2004a). Bush makes a similar statement, as follows: "And one of the things I'm going to talk

²⁵ For a list of specific organizations mentioned by President Bush, please refer to "Appendix E: Organizations Mentioned in Sample" on page 230.

about is how to expand America's service programs and how to make them better; and how to bring in new volunteers and, at the same time, make sure that which we're funding works, that we're actually meeting some goals" (2002g). Expanding programs and bringing in volunteers are indicative of this element of pastoral power. A country-wide and federally-funded initiative, Bush's faith-based plan may potentially affect a great many people. His repeated emphasis on the expansion of such programs is illustrative of this second aspect of new pastoral power.

Not only have religious groups endorsed President Bush's initiative, but secular organizations have as well. Bush states that he is "pleased that more than 150 mayors' offices across the country are launching their own efforts to encourage faith and community initiatives in partnership with the White House" (2001n). He firmly believes that, in order to be successful, additional groups must participate in his initiative. Bush says: "Charities and community groups cannot do everything. But we strongly believe they can do more. We must find creative ways to expand their size and increase their number. And now is the time to start" (2001n). Again, this quotation reveals the very essence of the second aspect of pastoral power, to add to the numbers of those equipped and federally funded to execute good works. Note also Bush's attention to time, asserting that "now is the time to start," which suggests a certain urgency in implementation.

As the funds flow to the various organizations, word simultaneously spreads about the government programs. Bush explains that "It's going to take a while to make sure that these faith-based offices which we've created in every Cabinet department—or most of the Cabinet departments in Washington—are able to get out the word" (2004g). "The word" being that government will no longer thwart the activities of the faith-based programs seeking federal assistance. President Bush views his presidency as markedly different from those that preceded him—he will fight against historical discrimination regarding faith-based groups and grant them

federal funds in the service of saving the souls and lives of Americans. Also, note the reference to time. President Bush appears to want to get these programs established as quickly as possible to “get out the word,” which is perhaps a Biblical allusion. With federal funding, Bush says that faith-based programs can be about their missions of “providing a social network of loving—helping loving souls interface with people so they can realize a better tomorrow” (2004e) thus providing a stepping stone to salvation in the here and now.

The means by which these funds are distributed to groups and help groups to grow is the Compassion Capital Fund, described by Bush as follows:

Three years ago I established the Compassion Capital Fund. It’s an innovative idea. It was a—the fund gives money to intermediary organizations that provide faith-based and community organizations with training, technical assistance—what it is, is like a little incubator. If you want to access federal money, here’s how you do it. If you want to start up a faith-based program, here’s some of the lessons learned. In other words, what we’re trying to say is not only are we going to allow those faith-based programs that already exist to access federal money, we want to help others spring up and understand the pitfalls to succeed. (2004e)

Bush’s rhetorical care for this fund is vaguely parental, speaking of the “incubator” of the fund, pumping money and life into his faith-based program. Bush also acknowledges the aim of the second tenet of pastoral power, that more agents of said power be added to the mix with the end goal of advancing various programs and organization-specific agendas—agendas that may not resonate with the majority of the American public. As other faith-based programs “spring up” having avoided the various governmental “pitfalls,” they will be welcomed into the existing circle

of agents, thus ever-widening that circle on a local and state level, as funds are distributed. In order for such groups to execute Bush's new pastoral power effectively, Bush and those in the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives must have a deep understanding of individual as well as community needs in order to guide their activities, and this is often accomplished via the family.

Individual and Community Knowledge

The third key to implementing pastoral power is dependent on an understanding of both the individual and the community in which he or she lives. Beyond that, Foucault did not elaborate much on this element of new pastoral power much in his article "The Subject and Power." Based on Blake's analysis, I have interpreted this to mean the intersection of the individual and community at large: the family. These three concerns, individual, family, and community present themselves throughout President Bush's speeches regarding the faith-based initiative.

With the individual in particular, Bush's focus is on solving problems such as addiction and doing so by changing hearts. It is a very unique understanding of a person that is not commonly held by a government official. Bush often describes individual problems in the context of the family that is afflicted. Bush says that "When men and women are lost to themselves, they are also lost to our nation" (2001i). This is important because it indicates the worth and necessity of every person in the health of the country, and addressing the situation that has brought them to hard times is best accomplished by faith-based communities. This is especially the case, as Bush says, because many people are more comfortable seeking help in a religious institution than in a professional office.

Bush's executive order establishing the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives mentions "strengthening families" as one of the office's "paramount goal[s of] compassionate results" (2001b). Because the nation is "built on strong families" (2002 b), there is a need to "promote strong families" (2002a). Bush is always emphatic when speaking about the importance of family, encouraging listeners to "honor family" (2001i) and to work with participating organizations to "make the American Dream a reality for more families" (2001f). Throughout this sample, President Bush makes reference to keeping families strong, which includes supporting the traditional conception of marriage. In his estimation: "I think one of the smartest things we can do is encourage families, and is to have a—is to spend money on grants to states to be matched by states, or grants directly to faith-based or community-based programs that teach people what it means to be in a successful marriage" (2004j).

Families seeking assistance from faith-based programs are facing a number of terrible problems. Bush regularly makes mention of those problems being suffered by families, such as inadequate housing, addiction, marital trouble, not enough money for food, lack of quality education for the children, insufficient jobs, and family violence—places where the family is definitely not "a place of support" (2003d). The services offered by groups participating in the faith-based initiative, however, can provide the assistance that will save a family in jeopardy—one soul, one heart at a time, all across America.

Bush states that "too many families are strained and fragile and broken" (2002a). Rehabilitating and reuniting these families, when possible, is critical to President Bush: "promoting strong families remains a priority for me as your president" (2002b). He praises organizations for "help[ing] families stay together" (2004c) and "church families" who can also help in areas such as the rehabilitation of prisoners (2004f). The Promoting Safe and Stable

Families Program is an example of a federal plan that is considered part of Bush's faith-based and community initiative. In 2002, President Bush signed a bill to authorize a yearly budget of \$505 million to that program (2002b). The Promoting Safe and Stable Families program is certainly dedicated to helping children.

Problems facing children, particularly children of troubled families, are also provided as reasons to justify various faith-based programs. Bush says: "Well, strong families really mean that children are going to grow up—children have a better chance to succeed—let's just be blunt about it. If a child grows up with a mom and a dad, they have a much better chance to succeed. We want everybody to succeed in America. If that's one of the keys to success, it seems like it makes sense to encourage strong families in America" (2004j). A program dedicated to helping children succeed is the Finishing School, an organization in D.C. where children can go after school. Bush explains, "it is a faith-based program. It is based upon God's love. As one of the teachers told me, kids need prayer. Faith teaches them that God can do anything. That's kind of the motto fo [sic] the program in a way. It's their operating credo. And now they're a recipient of federal money" (2004h). This quotation reveals an admitted case of a program receiving federal funds and proselytizing anyway. Helping members of the family, all members of the family, is critical to the stability of that group. Stability in the family unit is projected into the community.

Bush's repeated insistence on the primacy of the "armies of compassion" in the execution of his faith-based initiative is the key community element in his unique application of new pastoral power. Not government organizations, and not necessarily religious organizations either, these armies function within communities to promote the compassion agenda. most obviously articulated in their "hearing the call" to service. These armies have heard the call to love and service. Consider the following series of quotations dealing with the armies of compassion:

I've been so impressed by the faith-based leaders I've met all around the country, because there is a genuine commitment to the poor and the disadvantaged. And that's a commitment that we must channel and a commitment we must harvest. I used to say in the campaign, I look forward to rallying the soldiers in the armies of compassion. And I mean that. (2001m)

[T]hat law [to love a neighbor as you love yourself] comes from a higher calling than government. And the great challenge for our nation is to rally what I call 'the armies' of compassion all across America so that nobody is left behind. (2001o)

These soldiers in the armies of compassion deserve our support. They often need our support, and by taking their side we act in the best interests and tradition of our country. (2001j)

And it's important for America for Congress to pass my faith-based initiative so that government can stand side by side with the soldiers in the armies of compassion. . . . (2001c)

The purpose of this initiative is to rally the armies of compassion which are spread throughout the United States of America. (2002f)

There are lives to be saved; there are soldiers in the army of compassion ready to save them. And the federal government ought to be on the side of the soldiers in the armies of compassion. (2003e)

You've [the nation's mayors] got armies of compassion in your communities that I'm confident, by working together, we can unleash, for the betterment of the people we serve. (2004d)

[T]he strength of this country is in the hearts and souls of the soldiers in the army of compassion. (2004j)

The soldiers in the armies of compassion are generally linked to specific organizations, be they faith-based or secular. The important part about soldiers in the armies of compassion is that they go out into the communities and minister to individuals and families. Garnering that personal knowledge is central to Bush's new pastoral power in order to better guide them in resolving personal difficulties. Soldiers in the armies of compassion, most likely with beliefs and values consistent with the faith-based initiative, are incredibly valuable instruments in the execution of that program.

Another common theme in President Bush's speeches regarding the faith-based initiative is his constant, relentless in fact, admonition that people should love their neighbors. That this is not something government can force upon people, Bush explains, but is central to religious teachings. Bush says that: "for those who worship in houses of faith, regardless of their religion, whether it be Christian or Muslim or Jewish, and you want to help a neighbor in need and you want to access grant money—as far as I'm concerned, please come on. Please come on and hear the universal call to love a neighbor, just like you'd like to be loved, yourself" (2001h). Bush sums it up nicely in an address to people involved with the charity Habitat for Humanity:

This is the land of hope and promise and opportunity. And, as importantly, it is a land of compassionate people. I like to tell people that I wish I knew the law that I could sign that would make people love one

another. That's not the government, that comes from something much greater than people, as you all know. This is a land of faith and compassion. It is a land of thousands and hundreds of people who ask the question when they wake up, what can I do to love my neighbor [sic].

That is not a government function. That doesn't happen because of government, and you and I know that. And that's why it is so important for our nation to recognize the promise and power of faith in America. And that's why our government should not fear working side-by-side with faith-based organizations. Quite the opposite. We ought to fund faith-based organizations so that they can do their duty and love and compassion.

(2001)

In this quotation, Bush is attempting to disguise the nature of the relationship between government and organized religion while at the same time acknowledging the fact that government alone cannot foster a commitment between people. Funded faith-based (and community) groups dedicated to loving a neighbor can aid and support a person while simultaneously remaining steadfast to their, often religious, missions.

Bush sums up his perception of the role of faith-based communities in America in a speech to attendees at the Power Center in Houston on 12 September 2003. In the following lengthy quotation, Bush makes plain the ultimate goals and outcomes he finds possible with the successful implementation of his faith-based initiative:

I saw people's lives changed because of faith. Right here at the Power Center is a good example. I saw the fact that with the proper application of the call to love a neighbor like you'd like—love yourself, with resources

and social entrepreneurship, souls could change. And I recognized that at the time in Texas, and now nationally, that the absolute best way to make sure that the promise of America extends its reach into every neighborhood, the best way to help heal those who hurt, is to bring all the resources of our country to bear. *And the most powerful resource of all is the ability to transform lives through faith.* (Applause.)

I don't talk about a particular faith. I believe the Lord can work through many faiths, whether it be the *Christian faith, the Jewish faith, Muslim faith, Hindu faith.* When I speak of faith, I speak of all faiths, because there is a universal call, and *that main universal call is to love your neighbor. It extends throughout all faith.* [. . .]

People don't get their inspiration to help a neighbor in need from government. They get their inspiration from a higher being. And yet, government has thwarted faith to be involved in our communities because of what *they* call the doctrine of separation of church and state. And that's a noble doctrine; the church should never be the state, and the state certainly should never be the church. But our government must not fear the application of faith into solving social problems. We must not worry about people of faith receiving taxpayers' money to help people in need.

In my judgment, that doesn't obscure the line of church and state; it enhances the capacity of state to save lives, by tapping into this fundamental powerful resource of ours, the heart and soul of the American people. (2003e, emphasis added)

There are several noteworthy parts to this quotation. In the first paragraph, Bush says that “the most powerful resource of all is the ability to transform lives through faith.” Not only does this establish a hierarchy in which religion trumps government, it also violates Hart’s rhetorical contract by failing to maintain the guise of separation.

In the second paragraph, consider Bush’s assertion that he is not talking about any one specific denomination in his implementation of the faith-based initiative. Of course, this sounds like a reasonable plan. However, the majority of organizations that Bush mentions in this sample are Christian in nature. Proclaiming equality does not make it so, and Bush’s words do not match up with the actual distribution of funds by his Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and the government Cabinets also involved in that program. Moreover, Bush is trying to fit Christianity with these other religions in an attempt to downplay the actual religious pluralism.

In the third paragraph, Bush again places religious beliefs over the actions of government in his typical hierarchy, violating the rhetorical contract in the process. Also, Bush clearly establishes an adversary, the infamous “they” in this paragraph. This is important because it helps Bush distinguish between “us,” who would favor more church in the state, and “them,” who absolutely oppose it. Finally, in the third and fourth paragraphs, President Bush turns to the established argument over the separation of church and state.

Bush finishes this address by welcoming other religious groups in partnership. Through their active involvement in community affairs to identify people who are in need of services, another element of Bush’s brand of new pastoral power may be successfully implemented. Bush is certain about the success of such programs based on his own experience: “I also know programs that change the heart work. When a person changes their heart, they change their habits. Government is not good at changing hearts. The Almighty God is good at changing hearts—

(applause)—which happens to be the cornerstone of effective faith-based programs” (2004e). In essence, government is utterly unequipped to remedy the social problems facing society. Bush states:

Problems that face our society are oftentimes problems that require something greater than just a government program or a government counselor to solve. Intractable problems, problems that seem impossible to solve can be solved. There is the miracle of salvation in our—that is real, that is tangible, that is available for all to see. Miracles are possible in our society, one person at a time. (2004g)

Active partnership with religious organizations, funded by the federal government, assures success and lasting benefit for many bereft individuals—individuals who, once saved, may go on to positively affect others in the community. President Bush’s emphasis on talking to community leaders in addition to those leaders who are associated with organizations of faith shows that he is enacting individual and group understanding in the service of his new pastoral power.

Pastoral Power and the National Divide

President Bush’s faith-based initiative has been implemented nearly since the moment he assumed the presidency in 2001. Before he assumed the presidency, there was an acknowledgement of the cultural divide in America along religious lines. As the years have progressed, the notion of a divided America has been regularly commented on by members of the media. The following set of quotations demonstrates the ongoing discussion about and reality of the faith-based cultural divide in America:

President Bush’s promotion of faith-based social services is criticized by secular liberals even as it is hailed in some minority communities they

usually count as allies. Much like school vouchers, another sensitive issue on the border between church and state, “charitable choice” divides the purists who stand on constitutional principle from the pragmatists who just want to fund what works. (“Questions”)

Nationally, there appears to be split support of Bush’s plan . . .

A new poll . . . said 64% agreed that religious organizations should be allowed to compete with non-religious organizations for government funding . . . Only 30% opposed it. . .

But only 46% said they liked the idea that Bush was creating a faith-based initiative office in the White House. Thirty eight% [sic] don’t like that idea. (Raasch)

“President Bush came in as a uniter, but he has used religious values with scalpel precision to divide Catholics.” (Urban)

President Bush’s victory, the approval of every gay marriage amendment on statewide ballots and an emphasis on ‘moral values’ among voters showed the power of churchgoing Americans in this election and threw the nation’s religious divide into stark relief. (Associated Press)

The election, of course, didn’t create the religious divide in America—it only served to highlight how deep and abiding our religious and moral differences have become. (Haynes)

In 2007, the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives still has an active Web site filled with information about conferences, key programs, agencies and centers that work with the Office, and links to the weekly e-newsletter. Whatever the spread of the religious divide in

America, so long as President Bush is in office, the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives continues to operate.

Chapter IV: Conclusion

The tradition of civil religion in America has been successfully upheld by the nation's presidents since before Robert Bellah even gave that tradition a name. Used as a means to unify the public, the civil religion, when articulated by the president, contains ideals and beliefs that resonate with all Americans. Many times, there are distinctly religious tones to that language, and therefore the need arose to differentiate the nation's civil religion from actual, denominational religion. The two are definitely separate, scholars and theorists agree. Such a separation between the civil religion and actual religion parallels the separation of church and state. When civil religion is successfully rhetorically executed, there is no cause to feel that that separation is threatened. The key to that successful articulation, says Roderick Hart, is maintaining a balance between sacred and secular influences by means of a rhetorical contract between the two key parties in the civil religious tradition: government, personified by the president, and organized religion.

The Predecessors' Contractual Legacies

My analysis of President Bush's predecessors' rhetorical execution of the national civil religion reveals a few major consistencies: an acknowledgement of the necessity of separation of church and state in the affairs and governance of the nation; a recognition of the moral foundations religion can provide to individuals in their service to the nation; a tendency to use religious language in judicious amounts; and the tendency to identify organized religion and government as sporadic partners, if partners at all.

The guise of separation of government and religious organizations represents Hart's first contractual element. In each of the post-World War II presidents' texts I studied, there is a clear appreciation for the necessity of that divide. Time and again there are comments that the two should not meld—that this was the genius of the writers of the Constitution, and that as president, each man appreciates and acknowledges his duty to uphold that law. To the degree that any one president was encouraging cooperation with a particular religious group or denomination, that was not readily evident in the speeches and scholarly articles I sampled for this analysis.

In terms of the guise of existential equality between religious organizations and the government, President Bush's predecessors maintained that contractual element by not revealing the degree to which organized religion played any major part in policy decisions. Instead, each president mentions religious ideals as a foundation for individual action in day-to-day life. Religious organizations are not consulted in the construction of law and programs for the betterment of society. Government is the major player, these presidents' rhetoric affirms, and religious organizations serve a supplementary role at best.

Religious language seems to be the one element of Hart's rhetorical contract that is most renegotiated by each president as he assumes office. In the texts I sampled, it was obvious that some presidents felt more comfortable with using direct quotations and stories from Scripture than others. Furthermore, some presidents also eagerly incorporated prayers into their ceremonial address as well as their daily meetings. In all cases, as Hart points out, the presidents asked for God's guidance for themselves and the country as they attempted to execute the duties of the president. Overall, the predecessors' religious language was not sermonistic in tone. Instead, it conveyed the precepts of civil religion—that of moral fortitude and spiritual support—to the audience at-hand.

The most important part of Hart's contract for my analysis, that wherein the two parties do not reveal to the public the exact extent of their cooperation, has largely been successfully implemented by Bush's predecessors as well. While the presidents do acknowledge how religious organizations can be instrumental in facilitating programs to aid afflicted people, there is scarce mention of a substantial, definitive partnership between the two. The American public during the administrations of Bush's predecessors remained largely unaware, through presidential address at least, of the degree of cooperation between religious organizations and government in the execution of the country's activities.

George Bush's Faith-Based Legacy

While the speeches given by President Bush that I surveyed in this analysis do contain many traditional rhetorical applications of civil religion, the fact still remains that he has breached the terms of Hart's contract. This break with tradition and violation of contract is most evident in the fact that Bush and his Cabinet officers have supported and funded religious organizations through the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. Again, these religious organizations are in no way expected to change their missions in order to receive federal funds, even if that mission includes converting individuals who seek assistance to a particular belief. The speeches provided on the White House Web site by the Faith-Based Office reveal that, more than lauding religious morals as a foundation for an individual's actions in the world, religious organizations should become actively involved in the ministering to the nation. Such ministrations are enabled by federal funds without regard to organizations' religious charters and missions. Bush details in these addresses how religious organizations may participate in seminars and meetings to learn how to access these formerly forbidden federal funds. He explains repeatedly that the federal government, up until the time of his administration, has discriminated against faith-based

groups simply because they are faith-based. Bush further asserts that the funding of such groups does not in any way violate the tradition and mandate of church/state separation. This is his biggest breach of contract, openly and repeatedly acknowledging the partnership between government and organized religion by means of funds distributed by the office created expressly for that purpose, the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

In terms of the other contractual elements, President Bush also fails to maintain his obligations regarding the guises. As for the guise of separation, while Bush does briefly mention separation of church/state and the fact that he believes it is good and just, his words are belied by the fact of his actions in the establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives in addition to Cabinet posts devoted to the project. President Bush says that based on his judgment, his actions and Executive Orders do not violate the church/state separation. Bush does not maintain the guise of separation in deed, and only barely so in words.

The guise of existential equality is also threatened by Bush's rhetorical execution of civil religion. President Bush says on many occasions that government cannot put hope in hearts or make people love each other as a means to remedy social ills. He repeatedly asserts that it is the role and province of religious institutions to provide that support. By repeatedly announcing what government is incapable of doing, Bush gives more influence and relevance to religious organizations than Hart's contract allows. Instead of government being the more powerful party in the contract, religion gets an added boost by Bush's declaration that government is incapable of performing the social service tasks for which it is largely responsible. There is a hierarchy, and government is clearly not at the top of it.

As religious language goes, President Bush is consistent overall. Sometimes, he cites directly from the Bible; sometimes his words are thinly veiled, yet still Biblical in origin. At all

times, he acknowledges God in the history and success of the nation and the people who inhabit it. This element of the contract is perhaps the most flexible in terms of the speeches I have studied, and it depends largely upon the assembled audience. On occasions where President Bush addresses a religious group, his language is naturally more devout in nature than when he is among a secular audience. However, even in such cases where he is speaking to secular officials, Bush does not hesitate to include religious themes, terms, and precepts in his address.

Given the four elements of the rhetorical contract between organized religion and government provided by Hart, President Bush can be said to have breached each one: he fails to maintain the guise of separation between government and religious organizations, he fails to maintain the guise of existential equality between the two parties; he fails to curtail religious language in accordance with situation and audience; and, most importantly, he routinely divulges the extent of the cooperation between organized religion and government in the nation's affairs, specifically with regard to the establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

That religion plays such an important part in President Bush's ideas of how to govern the country leads to my assertion that he is applying his unique and modern-day version of new pastoral power in order to regulate his American constituency. Those that favor religious precepts as a means of governance are divided from those who do not agree with such a method. When Foucault described new pastoral power as enacted by government officials, he noted three elements in particular. I have interpreted and applied them as follows.

The first tenet of new pastoral power is that it assures individual salvation in this world, not the afterlife as traditional religion promises. This idea is evident in the faith-based plan Bush promotes, along with a traditional smattering of religion. He routinely mentions that the social

entrepreneurs and the soldiers in the armies of compassion are working miracles on a daily basis to save the lives of afflicted people. The emphasis is on these daily works to remedy ills in the immediate future—there is no direct mention of the afterlife, though of course it is implied by the inclusion of religious teachings in the salvation of people’s souls. More than just a recipe for helping people overcome personal problems, the faith-based plan encourages those providing the services to remain true to their personal missions, and these missions oftentimes include conversion of individuals and spreading of a particular religious, often Christian, message. Federal funding of these programs not only threatens the separation of church and state, it also perpetuates such teachings and programs throughout secular society.

The second aspect of new pastoral power, and most relevant to my analysis, is that it aims to increase the number of agents of that power. Again, President Bush infuses old characteristics into new pastoral power with his relentless recruiting of religious organizations for participation in the faith-based initiative. With the establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and Bush’s insistence that members of his Cabinet actively recruit and work with faith-based (and community) programs to secure funds, the number of agents will necessarily increase. With each visit to a ministry or a group of religious leaders, President Bush effectively increases the number of active participants in his faith-based social program. Furthermore, these organizations and individuals are being coached in the ways to best secure federal funds with the assurance of the president that the days of discriminating against a group simply because of its religious foundation are over. With such assurances, many organizations have applied for and received federal funds.

With his program, President Bush has demonstrated the third aspect of his brand of new pastoral power as well: that he understands the role of the individual and the community in the

application of such programs. He lauds religious messages as a means of securing a moral foundation upon which each person can build and exercise her or his influence as social entrepreneurs in the execution of this new power. With the federal funds and without threat to the mission of the administering office, the individuals are sent out into the communities ostensibly with the goal of helping people, but also with the goal of gaining more recruits and transforming a community. Those welcomed into the social programs provided by the religious organizations may feel obligated to continue the work that helped them. This begins the cycle of an ever expanding religious influence on secular life, funded by faithful and freethinker taxpayers alike. Again, the key is that the federal government, as directed by Executive Order, is mandated to implement this program until such time as a future president overturns the Order.

Consequences of Bush's Contractual Breach

As the representative of government, President Bush has breached the rhetorical contract between organized religion and government, mainly with the establishment of and continued funding and support of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives whose services include providing federal funds to organizations who may maintain their missions without regard to church/state separation. The very establishment of this office required President Bush to circumvent Congress and to establish the office by means of an Executive Order. Since the establishment of that office, there has been plentiful documentation on the dispersal of funds and the actions of groups receiving the funds. Whether or not those in the office may have been completely involved with the Bush plan, the fact still remains that money went out to primarily Christian organizations. This is problematic because such dispersal makes a mockery of Bush's attempts at inclusion of the myriad religious faiths when he speaks of Christian, Jew, or Muslim organizations. An already existing fissure in the American consciousness about the role of

religion in government is exacerbated by such discrepancies in words and acts. The cultural divide attested to and studied by scholars, journalists, and the average citizen alike can only be broadened by such policy.

By breaching the contract, President Bush has set a precedent for those who will follow him. His success indicates that future presidents may be able to implement similar plans with some success should their personal beliefs dictate such actions. In this way, the nondenominational and nonreligious civil religion that has served America for so long may likely become decidedly more religious in nature. The balance of power between the government and organized religion, with the successful implementation of programs like that funding faith-based groups, will be disrupted both figuratively and literally. No longer will rhetorical explanations be enough of a guise for the actual involvement of government and religious individuals in administering the business of the nation. A new kind of pastoral power reminiscent of older, far-away religion-fraught nations may revisit the United States of America—precisely the sort of conditions that many of the Founders came here to distance themselves from. Citizens might register their dissent at the voting booths, but once entrenched by repetition and successful execution, such a program might be hard to overturn.

The increasing importance and influence of religion is even evident in future potential presidents' words as they campaign for the 2008 election. Consider, for example, presidential candidate Barack Obama's assertion that "we make a mistake when we fail to acknowledge the power of faith in people's lives, in the lives of the American people. I think it's time that we joined a serious debate about how to reconcile faith with our modern pluralistic society" (NPR, "Obama"). Early in the campaign, Obama says that he is dedicated in his quest to "figure out how we can stop using religion as a divisive force in the body politic and how can we tap into that

sense that our values, or deepest moral commitments can be harnessed in order to bring about changes that might have seemed impossible if you were just looking at the realities of the here and now” (NPR, “Obama”). This quotation reveals a revived tendency in American politics to readily embrace religion and religious organizations in the administration of the country. That presidential candidates are already pontificating about the role of religion in society nineteen months away from the election is critical. It suggests that they are keenly aware that in order to garner the large Evangelical vote, they must convincingly speak in accordance with faith and all its ancillary values. This is one of many signs that President Bush has opened a rhetorical and religious door through which even Democrats must pass en route to the presidency. When asked whether such announcements of faith were helpful in campaigning, Obama’s response was “You know, what I think is that Democrats need to show up. I think it’s important that we don’t just abandon the field” (NPR, “Obama”). President Bush’s enthusiastic and voluminous religious commentary has paved the way for, and in some sense mandated, religious Republicans and Democrats alike to speak their truth to the American people.

The one aspect of Bush’s plan that means it may be reversed is the fact that he was forced to establish his faith-based initiative by Executive Order. Unlike a law that has successfully traversed through Congress, an Executive Order might be overturned by the next president, providing he is not of the same ideological stripe as President Bush. At the start of 2007, it is as yet difficult to predict who the next president might be. He or she will also inherit the responsibility to articulate the nation’s civil religion. He or she will also be charged with the task of unifying an increasingly diverse American public. Hart’s rhetorical contract may be honored once again, or the new president may also disregard those terms in favor of an ideologically straight-jacketed approach to governance whereby religious precepts are disbursed into the public

as a means of controlling individual action—all under the guise of helping the afflicted, loving a neighbor, and sharing God’s grace with humanity. Gutterman asserts that: “Beyond the policy aims of his administration, Bush is potentially transforming political discourse in the United States. Bush’s success has not just raised the level of acceptable religiosity, it may also make such religious talk a necessary feature of political discourse” (13-14). To the degree such rhetoric is necessary, there will likely be an increasing fissure between those Americans of orthodox faith, of nondenominational faith, and among those of no faith at all.

Works Cited

- American Civil Liberties Union. "House Passes Bush Initiative for Government-Funded Religion." 19 July 2001. 04 November 2006 <www.aclu.org/religion/govtfunding/16279prs20010719.html?s_src=RSS>.
- The Associated Press. "Election reinforces USA's religious schism." USA Today 2005. 04 January 2007 <http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/2004-11-04-religion_x.htm>.
- Barilleaux, Ryan J., and Mark J. Rozell. Power and Prudence: The Presidency of George H. W. Bush. College Station, Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
- Bauer, Gary. "Message to George W. Bush: Don't Be Clintonesque on Abortion." 28 July 2000. 22 January 2006 <http://www.beliefnet.com/story/34/story_3499_1.html>.
- Beasley, Vanessa B. "The Rhetoric of Ideological Consensus in the United States: American Principles and American Pose in Presidential Inaugurals." Communication Monographs 68.2 (June 2001): 169-183.
- . You, the People. College Station, Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
- Bellah, Robert N. The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial. 2nd ed. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . "Civil Religion in America." Dædalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. 96.1 (Winter 1967): 1-21.
- . "Religion and Legitimation in the American Republic." Society 35.2 (January/February 1998): 193-201.

Benne, Robert. "The Persistence of Civil Religion." A Journal of Theology 41.3 (Fall 2002): 178-179.

Bergman, Gerald. "The Influence of Religion on President Eisenhower's Upbringing." Journal of American and Comparative Cultures 23.4 (Winter 2000): 89-107.

Bible Gateway. 1995 - 2007. <www.biblegateway.com>.

Bible Tools. 1992 - 2007. <bibletools.org>.

Blake, Lynn A. "Pastoral power, governmentality and cultures of order in nineteenth-century British Columbia." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 24.1 (March 1999): 79-93. [<<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/rgs/tibg/1999/00000024/00000001/art00006>>.]

Boase, Paul H. "Moving the Mercy Seat Into the White House." The Journal of Communication and Religion 12.2 (September 1989): 1-9.

Boston, Rob. "Church-State Collision in Congress?" Church & State 59.1 (January 2006): 10-12.

Burns, Robert E. "Politicians shouldn't play the holy card." U.S. Catholic 65.1 (January 2000): 50.

Bush, George H. W. "Acceptance Speech." 18 August 1988. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 19 April 2007 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25955>>.

---. "Inaugural Address." 20 January 1989 Miller Center of Public Affairs. 19 September 2006 <http://millercenter.virginia.edu/scripps/diglibrary/prezspeeches/ghbush/ghb_1989_0120.html>.

- . "Remarks at the Annual National Prayer Breakfast." 04 May 1989. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 25 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=16997>>.
- Bush, George W. "America's Compassion in Action." Washington Hilton and Towers, Washington, D.C. 01 June **2004a**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/06/print/20040601-10.html>>.
- . "President Announces Initiatives to Combat Human Trafficking." Tampa Marriott Waterside Hotel, Tampa, Florida. 16 July **2004b**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/07/print/20040716-11.html>>.
- . "President Bush Discusses HIV/AIDS Initiatives in Philadelphia." People for People Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 23 June **2004c**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/06/print/20040623-4.html>>.
- . "President Bush Speaks with Nation's Mayors at Winter Meeting." Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C. 23 January **2004d**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/01/print/20040123-2.html>>.
- . "President Discusses Compassionate Conservative Agenda in Dallas." 122nd Knights of Columbus Convention, Hyatt Regency Dallas, Dallas, Texas. 03 August **2004e**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/08/print/20040803-11.html>>.
- . "President Emphasizes Minority Entrepreneurship at Urban League." 2004 National Urban League Conference, Detroit Marriot[t] Renaissance Hotel, Detroit, Michigan. 23 July **2004f**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/07/print/20040723-8.html>>.

- . "President Speaks with Faith-Based and Community Leaders." Union Bethel Ame Church, New Orleans, Louisiana. 15 January **2004g**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/01/print/20040115-7.html>>.
- . "President's Remarks at Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Conference." Los Angeles Convention Center, Los Angeles, California. 03 March **2004h**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/03/print/20040303-13.html>>.
- . "President's Remarks Via Satellite to the Southern Baptist Convention." 15 June **2004i**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/06/print/20040615-9.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President in a Conversation on Compassion." Adas Center, Cincinnati, Ohio. 21 June **2004j**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/06/print/20040621-5.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President to the National Governors Association." State Dining Room. 23 February **2004k**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/02/print/20040223-3.html>>.
- . "Remarks Via Satellite by the President to the National Association of Evangelicals Convention." The Map Room. 11 March **2004l**. 29 March 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/03/print/20040311-1.html>>.
- . "President Addresses Urban League." David Lawrence Convention Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. 28 July **2003a**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/07/print/20030728-3.html>>.

- . "President Bush Discusses Faith-Based Initiative in Tennessee." Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee. 10 February **2003b**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/print/20030210-1.html>>.
- . "President Bush Discusses Faith-Based Initiative with Urban Leaders." Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Room 450, Washington, D.C. 16 July **2003c**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/07/print/20030716-2.html>>.
- . "President Bush Proclaims October Domestic Violence Awareness Month." The East Room. 08 October **2003d**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/10/print/20031008-5.html>>.
- . "President Discusses Faith-Based Initiative at Power Center Celebration." Power Center, Houston Texas. 12 September **2003e**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/09/20030912-14.html>>.
- . "President Discusses Faith-Based Initiative at Youth Education Center." Oak Cliff Bible Fellowship Youth Education Center, Dallas, Texas. 29 October **2003f**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/10/print/20031029-10.html>>.
- . "President Announces Welfare Reform Agenda." St. Luke's Catholic Church. Washington, D.C. 26 February **2002a**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/02/20020226-11.html>>.
- . "President Bush Acts to Promote Strong Families, Safe Children." The White House. 17 January **2002b**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/print/20020117-6.html>>.

- . "President Bush Implements Key Elements of his Faith-Based Initiative." Downtown Marriott Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 12 December **2002c**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/print/20021212-3.html>>.
- . "President Bush, Sen Lieberman Discuss Armies of Compassion." The Oval Office. 07 February **2002d**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/02/print/20020207-9.html>>.
- . "President Emphasizes Need for Welfare Reform." Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 02 July **2002e**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/07/print/20020702-2.html>>.
- . "President Names New Faith-Based & Community Initiatives Director." Remarks by the President and Jim Towey in Announcement of the New Director of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. The Roosevelt Room. 01 February **2002f**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/02/print/20020201-4.html>>.
- . "President Outlines Principles for Public Service." Klein Auditorium, Bridgeport, Connecticut. 09 April **2002g**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/04/print/20020409-3.html>>.
- . "President Promotes Faith-Based Initiative." The East Room. 11 April **2002h**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/04/print/20020411-5.html>>.
- . "President Speaks to Community Leaders in Los Angeles." First African Methodist Episcopal Renaissance Center, Los Angeles, California. 29 April **2002i**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/04/print/20020429-7.html>>.

- . "President's Remarks at National Prayer Breakfast." Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C. 07 February **2002j**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/02/print/20020207-1.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President Via Satellite to the Southern Baptist Convention 2002 Annual Meeting." Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Room 459, Washington, D.C. 11 June **2002k**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/print/20020611-5.html>>.
- . Executive Order 13198. Agency Responsibilities with Respect to Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. 29 January **2001a**. 26 November 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/01/20010129-3.html>>.
- . Executive Order 13199. Establishment of White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. 29 January **2001b**. 25 November 2005 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/01/20010129-2.html>>.
- . "President Bush Speaks to Participants of America's Promise." The Rose Garden, Washington, D.C. 09 July **2001c**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/07/print/20010709-1.html>>.
- . "President George W. Bush's Inaugural Address." 20 January **2001d**. 15 October 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/inaugural-address.html>>.
- . "President Urges Support for America's Charities." Remarks by the President At So Others Might Eat, Washington, D.C. 20 November **2001e**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/print/20011120-5.html>>.
- . "Radio Address by the President to the Nation." 09 June **2001f**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/06/print/20010608-7.html>>.

- . Rallying the Armies of Compassion. January **2001g**. 09 November 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/reports/faithbased.pdf>>.
- . "Remarks by the President at Habitat for Humanity Event." Waco, Texas. 08 August **2001h**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/08/print/20010808-2.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President in Commencement Address University of Notre Dame." Notre Dame, Indiana. 21 May **2001i**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/05/print/20010521-1.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President in Independence Day Celebration." Independence National Park. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 04 July **2001j**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/07/print/20010704-2.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President in Meeting with Leadership of National Service Organizations." The Roosevelt Room. 02 July **2001k**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/07/20010702-1.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President to Habitat for Humanity Supporters." 3722 Wiggins Leaf Street, Tampa, Florida. 05 June **2001l**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/06/print/20010606.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President to the National Leadership of the Hispanic Faith-Based Organizations." Dwight D. Eisenhower Office Building, Washington, D.C. 22 May **2001m**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/05/print/20010523-1.html>>.

- . "Remarks by the President to the United States Conference of Mayors." Detroit Marriott Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan. 25 June **2001n**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/06/print/20010625-2.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President to St. Augustine Parish." Our Lady of Angeles - St. Joseph Center, Cleveland, Ohio. 24 May **2001o**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/05/print/20010524-1.html>>.
- . "Remarks by the President While Touring Youth Entertainment Academy." Grace Episcopal Church, Plainfield, New Jersey. 14 March **2001p**. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/03/20010314-2.html>>.
- . A Charge To Keep. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1999.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. Deeds Done in Words: Presidential Rhetoric and the Genres of Governance. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Carter, James E. "Christmas Pageant of Peace Remarks on Lighting the National Community Christmas Tree." 18 December 1980. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 10 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=44421>>.
- . "Inaugural Address of President Jimmy Carter Following His Swearing In as the 39th President of the United States." 20 January 1977. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 24 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=6575>>.
- CBS News. "Poll: America's Cultural Divide." 22 November 2004. 16 January 2006 <<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/11/22/opinion/polls/printable657068.shtml>>.

- Chernus, Ira. "Inaugural Address Blends Politics and Religion." n.d.: 3 pp. 09 May 2006 <<http://spot.colorado.edu/~chernus/NewspaperColumns/TheBushAdministration/BushInauguralAddress2005.htm>>.
- Clinton, William J. "Inaugural Address." 20 January 1993. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 02 January 2007 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=46366>>.
- . "Remarks at a Breakfast with Religious Leaders." 28 September 1999. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 10 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=56598>>.
- Coe, Kevin, and David Domke. "Petitioners or Prophets? Presidential Discourse, God, and the Ascendancy of Religious Conservatives." Journal of Communication 56.2 (June 2006): 309-330.
- Coleman, John A. "Civil Religion." Sociological Analysis 31 (Summer 1970): 67-77.
- Cristi, Marcela. From Civil to Political Religion: The Intersection of Culture, Religion and Politics. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001.
- Daughton, Suzanne M. "Metaphorical Transcendence: Images of the Holy War in Franklin Roosevelt's First Inaugural." Quarterly Journal of Speech 79.4 (1993): 427-446.
- Davis, Derek H. "Thoughts on the Separation of Church and State under the Administration of President George W. Bush." [Editorial] Journal of Church and State 45.2 (Spring 2003): 229-235.
- Donahue, Bernard F. "The Political Use of Religious Symbols: A Case Study of the 1972 Presidential Campaign." Review of Politics 37.1 (January 1975): 48-65.

Duin, Julia. "Hopefuls put their faith in campaigns." 05 February 2004. 21 May 2004 <<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040205-120813-3550r.htm>>.

Edsall, Thomas B. "Grants Flow To Bush Allies On Social Issues." washingtonpost.com 22 March 2006. 04 November 2006 <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/21/AR2006032101723.html>>.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. "First Inaugural Address: Tuesday, January 20, 1953." 2005. 10 November 2006 <<http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres54.html>>.

---. "Remarks at a Luncheon Meeting of the General Board of the National Council of Churches." 18 November 1953. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 16 January 2007 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=9768>>.

Erickson, Keith V. "Jimmy Carter: The Rhetoric of Private and Civic Piety." The Western Journal of Speech Communication 44.3 (Summer 1980): 221-235.

Fineman, Howard. "Bush and God." Newsweek 141.10 (10 March 2003): 22-30.

Ford, Gerald R. "Remarks at the Southern Baptist Convention in Norfolk, Virginia." 15 June 1976. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 08 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=6127>>.

---. "Remarks on Taking the Oath of Office as President." 09 August 1974. Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library and Museum. 04 November 2006 <<http://www.ford.utexas.edu/LIBRARY/speeches/740001.htm>>.

Fotheringham, Allan. "Reagan Recruits the Lord." Maclean's 18 February 1985: 60.

- Foucault, Michel. "Pastoral power and political reason (1979)." Religion and Culture. Selected and edited by Jeremy R. Carrette. New York: Routledge, 1999. 135-152.
- . "The Subject and Power." Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rainbow. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982. 208-226.
- Frank, Thomas. What's the Matter with Kansas? How Conservatives Won the Heart of America. New York: Owl Books, Henry Holt and Company, LLC., 2004.
- Friedenberg, Robert V. "Rhetoric, Religion and Government at the Turn of the 21st Century." The Journal of Communication and Religion 25.1 (March 2002): 34-48.
- Gehrig, Gail. American Civil Religion: An Assessment. [Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. Monograph Series. Number 3.] Romeoville, IL: Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1979.
- . "The American Civil Religion Debate: A Source for Theory Construction." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 20.1 (March 1981): 51-63.
- Gibbs, Nancy. "Faith Factor, The." TIME 163.25 (21 June 2004): 26-30, 33.
- Government Accountability Office. Faith Based and Community Initiative: Improvements in Monitoring Grantees and Measuring Performance Could Enhance Accountability. Report to Congressional Requesters. Washington: GAO: 2006. <<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06616.pdf>>.
- Gunn, Joshua. "The Rhetoric of Exorcism: George W. Bush and the Return of Political Demonology." Western Journal of Communication 68.1 (Winter 2004): 1-23.
- Gustafson, Merlin. "The Religion of a President." Journal of Church and State 10 (10 August 1968): 379-387.

---. "The Religious Role of the President." Midwest Journal of Political Science 14.4 (November 1970): 708-722.

Gutterman, David S. "Presidential Testimony: Listening to the Heart of George W. Bush." Theory & Event 5.2 (2001): 18 pp. 28 June 2005 <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v005/5.2gutterman.html>.

Habitat for Humanity. "Habitat for Humanity Fact Sheet." 2007. 01 February 2007 <www.habitat.org/how/factsheet.aspx >.

Hahn, Dan F. "One's Reborn Every Minute: Carter's Religious Appeal in 1976." Communication Quarterly 28.3 (Summer 1980): 56-62.

Hart, Roderick P. "God, Country, and a World of Words." The Journal of Communication and Religion 25.1 (March 2002): 136-147.

---. The Political Pulpit. West Lafayette: The Purdue University Press, 1977.

Hart, Roderick P. and John L. Pauley II, eds. The Political Pulpit Revisited. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2004.

Haynes, Charles C. "Inside the 1st Amendment—Fighting over religion: What to watch for in 2005." The Providence Journal 02 January 2005: F-05. [Retrieved 04 January 2007 from LexisNexis.]

Hoffman, Donna R., and Alison D. Howard. "Agendas, Rhetoric, and Social Change: State of the Union Addresses from Eisenhower to Clinton." 2003 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Palmer House Hilton, Chicago. 03-06 Apr. 2003.

Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ. "Holy Redeemer Mission." 2006. 04 January 2007 <<http://www.hrcogic.org/mission.html>>.

- Horowitz, David. "‘I’m a uniter, not a divider’." 06 May 1999. 24 January 2006 <<http://www.salon.com/news/feature/1999/05/06/bush/>>.
- Hutcheson, Richard G., Jr. God in the White House: How Religion Has Changed the Modern Presidency. New York: Collier Books, 1988.
- Independent, The. "George W. Bush a divider after all." [Editorial]. 20 January 2004. 24 January 2006 <<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0120-05.htm>>.
- Jelen, Ted G., and Clyde Wilcox. "Conscientious Objectors in the Culture War?: A Typology of Attitudes Toward Church-State Relations." Sociology of Religion 58.3 (1997): 277-287.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress. November 27, 1963." 27 November 1963. 27 August 2006 <<http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/Johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/631127.asp>>.
- . "The President’s Inaugural Address." 20 January 1965. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 02 January 2007 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=26985>>.
- . "Remarks in Austin at the Dedication of the Agudas Achim Synagogue." 30 December 1963 [b]. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 10 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=26720>>.
- Johnstone, Christopher L. "Electing Ourselves in 1976: Jimmy Carter and The American Faith." Western Journal of Speech Communication 42.4 (Fall 1978): 241-249.
- Kaplan, Esther. With God on Their Side: How Christian Fundamentalists Trampled Science, Policy, and Democracy in George W. Bush’s White House. New York: The New Press, 2004.

- Kengor, Paul. God and George W. Bush: A Spiritual Life. New York: Regan Books, 2004.
- Kennedy, John F. "Address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association." American Rhetoric. 2006. 09 May 2006 <<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/johnfkennedyhoustonministerialspeech.html>>.
- . "Inaugural Address." 20 January 1961. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 02 January 2007 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=8032>>.
- Kettle, Martin. "The disunited states of America." 15 November 2000. 21 January 2006 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/US_election_race/Story/0,2763,397819,00.html>.
- Kranish, Michael. "Democrats inspect faith-based initiative." The Boston Globe 04 December 2006. 08 January 2007 <www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2006/12/04/democrats_inspect_faith_based_initiative/>.
- Lakely, James G. "President outlines role of his faith." The Washington Times 12 January 2005. 04 February 2005 <www.washingtontimes.com/national/20050111-101004-3771r.htm>.
- Lawrence, Jill. "Bush's agenda walks the church-state line." USA TODAY. 29 January 2003. 04 January 2007 <www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-01-29-bush-religion_x.htm>.
- . "Church aisle is wide cultural divide." USA TODAY. [Collegiate Case Study]. 19 February 2002. 16 January 2006 <www.usatoday.com/educate/college/polisci/casestudies/20020813-nationdivided-b.pdf>.
- Lee, Ronald. "The Force of Religion in the Public Square." The Journal of Communication and Religion 25.1 (March 2002): 6-20.
- Linder, Robert D. "Universal Pastor: President Bill Clinton's Civil Religion." Journal of Church & State 38.4 (01 September 1996): 733-749.

Mallaby, Sebastian. "Stop the Celebration." The New Republic 219.3/4 (July 20 & 27 1998): 19-21.

Marvin, Carolyn. "A New Scholarly Dispensation for Civil Religion." The Journal of Communication and Religion 25.1 (March 2002): 21-33.

McCarthy, Eugene J. "Outside Help." 2000: 1-3. 24 March 2006 <<http://www.populist.com/00.15.mccarthy.html>>.

McGee, Michael C. "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative." Quarterly Journal of Speech 61.3 (October 1975): 235-249.

"Mr. Reagan's Civil Religion." Commonweal 111.13 (21 September 1984): 483-485.

National Public Radio. "Obama Works to Win Evangelicals Back for Democrats." Morning Edition. 14 July 2006. [Transcript.] 23 April 2007 <<http://www.npr.org>>.

NBC's Meet the Press. "Meet the Press with Tim Russert" "Interview with President George W. Bush." 07 February 2004. [Broadcast 08 February 2004.] 24 January 2006 <<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/4179618/>>.

Nixon, Richard M. "Inaugural Address." 20 January 1969. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 02 January 2007 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=1941>>.

---. "Remarks at Dr. Billy Graham's East Tennessee Crusade." 28 May 1970. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 09 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=2523>>.

Novak, Michael. Choosing Our King: Powerful Symbols in Presidential Politics. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.

- Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. "President Bush's Speeches on FBCI." n.d. 05 February 2007 <www.whitehouse.gov/government/fbci/archive.html >.
- . Guidance to Faith-Based and Community Organizations on Partnering with the Federal Government. n.d. 04 January 2007 <www.whitehouse.gov/government/fbci/guidance_document.pdf >.
- Ofulue, Nneka Ifeoma. "President Clinton and the White House Prayer Breakfast." The Journal of Communication and Religion 25.1 (March 2002): 49-63.
- "One nation, fairly divisible, Under God." Economist 358.8205 (20 January 2001). [EBSCOhost Academic Search Premier].
- Pauley, Garth E. "Rhetoric and Timeliness: An analysis of Lyndon B. Johnson's Voting Rights Address." Western Journal of Communication 62.1 (Winter 1998): 26-53.
- Pauley, John, II. "Religion, Politics, and Rhetoric: Twenty-five Years After *The Political Pulpit*." The Journal of Communication and Religion 25.1 (March 2002): 1-5.
- Peterson, Jonathan. "The Nation: New Life for Bush's Faith-Based Plan." Los Angeles Times. 09 November 2002: A35. [Retrieved 04 November 2006 from ProQuest.]
- Pierard, Richard V. "Civil Religion: A Case Study Showing How Some Baptists Went Astray on the Separation of Church and State." 04 June 2001. [Christian Ethics Today 008. 2.4, November 1996] 16 March 2006 <http://www.christianethicstoday.com/Issue/008/Civil%20Religion%20By%20Richard%20V%20Pierard_008_4_.htm>.
- Pierard, R. V., and R. D. Linder. Civil Religion and the Presidency. Grand Rapids, MI: Academic Books, 1988.
- Plato. Statesman. Trans. C. J. Rowe. Warminster: Airs & Phillips Ltd., 1995.

- “Questions of Faith.” [Editorial.] The Boston Globe. 04 February 2001: E6. [Retrieved 04 January 2007 from LexisNexis.]
- Raasch, Chuck. “America separated on Bush’s faith-based initiatives.” USA Today. 22 February 2001. 04 November 2006 <<http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/raasch/r084.htm>>.
- Reagan, Ronald. “Inaugural.” 20 January 1981. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 10 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=43130>>.
- . “Remarks at the Annual Convention of the National Religious Broadcasters.” 31 January 1983. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 10 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/print.php?pid=40550>>.
- “Religion on the United States.” Wikipedia. 01 February 2007. 03 February 2007 <en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religion_in_the_United_States>.
- Rouner, Leroy S. “What Is an American? Civil Religion, Cultural Diversity and American Civilization.” Spring 1999: 1-4. 12 November 2005 <<http://www.pbk.org/pubs/Keyreporter/Spring99/Rouner.htm>>.
- Shepherd, William C. “Robert Bellah’s Sociology of Religion: The Theoretical Elements.” Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 14.4 (December 1975): 395-402.
- Stackhouse, Max L. “Civil Religion, Political Theology and Public Theology: What’s the Difference?” Political Theology 5.3 (July 2004): 275-293.
- Strode, Tom. “Election-year controversy over expressions of faith caused by cultural divide, Land says.” 13 September 2004. 17 September 2004 <<http://www.bpnews.net/bpnews.asp?ID=19082>>.

Stuckey, Mary E. "Anecdotes and Conversations: The Narrational and Dialogic Styles of Modern Presidential Communication." Communication Quarterly 40.1 (Winter 1992): 45-55.

---. Defining Americans: The Presidency and National Identity. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2004.

---. "Legitimizing Leadership: The Rhetoric of Succession as a Genre of Presidential Discourse." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 22.2 (Spring 1992): 25-38.

Tenpas, Kathryn D., and Stephen Hess. "The Contemporary Presidency: The Bush White House: First Appraisals." Presidential Studies Quarterly 32.3 (September 2002): 577-585.

Thomas, Michael C., and Charles C. Flippen. "American Civil Religion: An Empirical Study." Social Forces 51.2 (December 1972): 218-225.

Truman, Harry S. "Address in Columbus at a Conference of the Federal Council of Churches." 06 March 1946. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 08 November 2006 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=12599>>.

---. "Inaugural Address." 20 January 1949. The American Presidency Project. John Woolley and Gerhard Peters, eds. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. 2005. 02 January 2007 <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=1328http://www.whitehouse.gov/history/presidents/ht33.html2>>.

Urban, Peter. "Religious matters may sway election." Connecticut Post 27 July 2004. [Retrieved 04 January 2007 from LexisNexis.]

The White House. "Harry S. Truman." n.d. 20 January 2007 <www.whitehouse.gov/history/presidents/ht33.html>.

Wimberly, Ronald C. "Civil Religion and the Choice for President: Nixon in '72." Social Forces 59.1 (September 1980): 44-61.

Wimberly, Ronald C., and William H. Swatos, Jr. "Civil Religion." n.d.: 5 pp. 16 March 2006
<<http://hirr.hartsem.edu/ency/civilrel.htm>>.

Wolfson, Adam. "One Nation Under God?" Commentary 114.3 (October 2002): 44-49.

Zogby International. "America Culturally Divided; Blue vs. Red States, Democrats vs. Republicans - Two Separate Nations, New O'Leary Report/Zogby Poll Reveals." 06 January 2004. 22 January 2006 <<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=775>>.

Appendix A: Hart's Rhetorical Contract

Chapter 3 of The Political Pulpit is entitled "American Civic Piety: An Alternative Understanding." That chapter begins with Hart's conception of the rhetorical contract between government and organized religion. The rhetorical contract reads as follows:

This contract, made Each day of Each Month between the United States Government, herein called the "first party", and Organized Religion, herein called the [sic] second party";

WITNESSETH: That for and in recognition and performance of the covenants contained herein on the part of both parties in the manner hereinafter specified, let both parties recognize that: A) Religion is capable of providing an ultimate meaning system for its adherents; B) Government is able to exert coercive power on the affairs of its citizens; and C) Both government and religion wield considerable rhetorical power both within their respective sectors and across sectors.

This contract is made by the aforementioned parties and is accepted upon the following conditions, and it is agreed that each of the terms hereinafter specified shall be a condition. The breach, default, failure or violation of any one or more thereof shall entitle the innocent party to terminate this contract. In addition, should any first party official fail to pay tacit homage to religion, he or she shall be branded un-American and declared non-electable; and, should any member of any second party body

fail to abide by the stated conditions or in any other manner to deny God's approbation of governmental policy, both foreign and domestic, he or she shall be labeled radical and denied an opportunity to offer the benediction at political gatherings.

Let it furthermore be agreed to that:

1. The guise of complete separation between the first party and the second party will be maintained by both parties.

2. The guise of existential equality between the first party and the second party will be maintained by both parties, but the second party's realm shall be solely that of the rhetorical.

3. First party rhetoric will refrain from being overly religious and second party rhetoric will refrain from being overly political.

4. Neither of the aforementioned parties shall, in any fashion whatsoever, make known to the general populace the exact terms of the contract contained herein.

This agreement shall inure to the benefit of both parties, and their successors in interest.

WITNESS our hands, the day and year first above written.

The Government Incarnate

FIRST PARTY

Mainstream Religion

SECOND PARTY

The American Citizenry-as-Audience

WITNESS

Appendix B: Executive Order 13198

On 29 January 2001, just nine days after being sworn into office, President George Bush created the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives with an executive order. He also issued an Executive Order detailing how the various Cabinet agencies would work with the new Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. That order detailing the expectations of the Cabinet offices reads as follows:

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to help the Federal Government coordinate a national effort to expand opportunities for faith-based and other community organizations and to strengthen their capacity to better meet social needs in America's communities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Establishment of Executive Department Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. (a) The Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall each establish within their respective departments a Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (Center).

(b) Each executive department Center shall be supervised by a Director, appointed by the department head in consultation with the White

House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (White House OFBCI).

(c) Each department shall provide its Center with appropriate staff, administrative support, and other resources to meet its responsibilities under this order.

(d) Each department's Center shall begin operations no later than 45 days from the date of this order.

Sec. 2. Purpose of Executive Department Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. The purpose of the executive department Centers will be to coordinate department efforts to eliminate regulatory, contracting, and other programmatic obstacles to the participation of faith-based and other community organizations in the provision of social services.

Sec. 3. Responsibilities of Executive Department Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. Each Center shall, to the extent permitted by law: (a) conduct, in coordination with the White House OFBCI, a department-wide audit to identify all existing barriers to the participation of faith-based and other community organizations in the delivery of social services by the department, including but not limited to regulations, rules, orders, procurement, and other internal policies and practices, and outreach activities that either facially discriminate against or otherwise discourage or disadvantage the participation of faith-based and other community organizations in Federal programs;

(b) coordinate a comprehensive departmental effort to incorporate faith-based and other community organizations in department programs and initiatives to the greatest extent possible;

(c) propose initiatives to remove barriers identified pursuant to section 3(a) of this order, including but not limited to reform of regulations, procurement, and other internal policies and practices, and outreach activities;

(d) propose the development of innovative pilot and demonstration programs to increase the participation of faith-based and other community organizations in Federal as well as State and local initiatives; and

(e) develop and coordinate department outreach efforts to disseminate information more effectively to faith-based and other community organizations with respect to programming changes, contracting opportunities, and other department initiatives, including but not limited to Web and Internet resources.

Sec. 4. Additional Responsibilities of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor Centers. In addition to those responsibilities described in section 3 of this order, the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor Centers shall, to the extent permitted by law: (a) conduct a comprehensive review of policies and practices affecting existing funding streams governed by so-called “Charitable Choice” legislation to assess the department’s compliance with the requirements of Charitable Choice; and (b) promote

and ensure compliance with existing Charitable Choice legislation by the department, as well as its partners in State and local government, and their contractors.

Sec. 5. Reporting Requirements. (a) Report. Not later than 180 days after the date of this order and annually thereafter, each of the five executive department Centers described in section 1 of this order shall prepare and submit a report to the White House OFBCI.

(b) Contents. The report shall include a description of the department's efforts in carrying out its responsibilities under this order, including but not limited to:

(1) a comprehensive analysis of the barriers to the full participation of faith-based and other community organizations in the delivery of social services identified pursuant to section 3(a) of this order and the proposed strategies to eliminate those barriers; and

(2) a summary of the technical assistance and other information that will be available to faith-based and other community organizations regarding the program activities of the department and the preparation of applications or proposals for grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, and procurement.

(c) Performance Indicators. The first report, filed 180 days after the date of this order, shall include annual performance indicators and measurable objectives for department action. Each report filed thereafter

shall measure the department's performance against the objectives set forth in the initial report.

Sec. 6. Responsibilities of All Executive Departments and Agencies.

All executive departments and agencies (agencies) shall: (a) designate an agency employee to serve as the liaison and point of contact with the White House OFBCI; and

(b) cooperate with the White House OFBCI and provide such information, support, and assistance to the White House OFBCI as it may request, to the extent permitted by law.

Sec. 7. Administration and Judicial Review. (a) The agencies? [sic] actions directed by this Executive Order shall be carried out subject to the availability of appropriations and to the extent permitted by law.

(b) This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

George W. Bush

The White House

January 29, 2001

Appendix C: Executive Order 13199

On 29 January 2001, just nine days after being sworn into office, President George Bush created the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives with an executive order. The order reads as follows:

By the authority vested in me as President of the United States by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to help the Federal Government coordinate a national effort to expand opportunities for faith-based and other community organizations and to strengthen their capacity to better meet social needs in America's communities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Policy. Faith-based and other community organizations are indispensable in meeting the needs of poor Americans and distressed neighborhoods. Government cannot be replaced by such organizations, but it can and should welcome them as partners. The paramount goal is compassionate results, and private and charitable community groups, including religious ones, should have the fullest opportunity permitted by law to compete on a level playing field, so long as they achieve valid public purposes, such as curbing crime, conquering addiction, strengthening families and neighborhoods, and overcoming poverty. This delivery of social services must be results oriented and should value the bedrock principles of pluralism, nondiscrimination, evenhandedness, and neutrality.

Sec. 2. Establishment. There is established a White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (White House OFBCI) within the Executive Office of the President that will have lead responsibility in the executive branch to establish policies, priorities, and objectives for the Federal Government's comprehensive effort to enlist, equip, enable, empower, and expand the work of faith-based and other community organizations to the extent permitted by law.

Sec. 3. Functions. The principal functions of the White House OFBCI are, to the extent permitted by law:

(a) to develop, lead, and coordinate the Administration's policy agenda affecting faith-based and other community programs and initiatives, expand the role of such efforts in communities, and increase their capacity through executive action, legislation, Federal and private funding, and regulatory relief.

(b) to ensure that Administration and Federal Government policy decisions and programs are consistent with the President's state goals with respect to faith-based and other community initiatives;

(c) to help integrate the President's policy agenda affecting faith-based and other community organizations across the Federal Government;

(d) to coordinate public education activities designed to mobilize public support for faith-based and community nonprofit initiatives through volunteerism, special projects, demonstration pilots, and public-private partnerships;

(e) to encourage private charitable giving to support faith-based and community initiatives;

(f) to bring concerns, ideas, and policy options to the President for assisting, strengthening, and replicating successful faith-based and other community programs;

(g) to provide policy and legal education to State, local, and community policymakers and public officials seeking ways to empower faith-based and other community organizations and to improve the opportunities, capacity, and expertise of such groups;

(h) to develop and implement strategic initiatives under the President's agenda to strengthen the institutions of civil society and America's families and communities;

(i) to showcase and herald innovative grassroots nonprofit organizations and civic initiatives;

(j) to eliminate unnecessary legislative, regulatory, and other bureaucratic barriers that impede effective faith-based and other community efforts to solve social problems;

(k) to monitor implementation of the President's agenda affecting faith-based and other community organizations; and

(l) to ensure that the efforts of faith-based and other community organizations meet high standards of excellence and accountability.

Sec. 4. Administration.

(a) The White House OFBCI may function through established or ad hoc committees, task forces, or interagency groups.

(b) The White House OFBCI shall have a staff to be headed by the Assistant to the President for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. The White House OFBCI shall have such staff and other assistance, to the extent permitted by law, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this order. The White House OFBCI operations shall begin no later than 30 days from the date of this order.

(c) The White House OFBCI shall coordinate with the liaison and point of contact designated by each executive department and agency with respect to this initiative.

(d) All executive departments and agencies (agencies) shall cooperate with the White House OFBCI and provide such information, support, and assistance to the White House OFBCI as it may request, to the extent permitted by law.

(e) The agencies' actions directed by this Executive Order shall be carried out subject to the availability of appropriations and to the extent permitted by law.

Sec. 5. Judicial Review. This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

George W. Bush

The White House

January 29, 2001

Appendix D: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative

The White House Web site provides a list of first-term speeches given by President George W. Bush regarding the faith-based initiative that I have used in my analysis. Those speeches are listed below.

Table D.1: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative

Date	Speech
14 March 2001	President Bush Tours Youth Entertainment Academy at the Grace Episcopal Church in Plainfield New Jersey Remarks by the President While Touring Youth Entertainment Academy Grace Episcopal Church; Plainfield, New Jersey
21 May 2001	Remarks by the President in Commencement Address - Notre Dame Remarks by the President in Commencement Address University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Indiana
22 May 2001	President Bush speaks to National Leadership of the Hispanic Faith-Based Organizations Remarks by the President to the National Leadership of the Hispanic Faith-Based Organizations Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building
24 May 2001	President Bush Speaks to St. Augustine Parish in Cleveland, Ohio Remarks by the President to St. Augustine Parish Our Lady of Angeles-St. Joseph Center; Cleveland, Ohio
05 June 2001	President Bush Speaks to Habitat for Humanity Supporters Remarks by the President to Habitat for Humanity Supporters 3722 Wiggins Leaf Street; Tampa, Florida
09 June 2001	Radio Address by the President to the Nation
25 June 2001	President Discusses Faith-Based Initiative at Conference of Mayors Remarks by the President To the United States Conference of Mayors Detroit Marriott Renaissance Center; Detroit, Michigan

Table D.1: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative (Continued)

Date	Speech
02 July 2001	President Bush Meets with Leadership of National Service Organizations Remarks by the President in Meeting with Leadership of National Service Organizations The Roosevelt Room
04 July 2001	President Bush Speaks at Independence Day Celebration Remarks by the President In Independence Day Celebration Independence Historic National Park; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
09 July 2001	President Bush Speaks to Participants of America's Promise The Rose Garden
08 August 2001	President Discusses Faith Based and Community Initiative at Habitat for Humanity Event Remarks by the President at Habitat for Humanity Event Waco, Texas
20 November 2001	President Urges Support for America's Charities Washington, D.C
17 January 2002	President Bush Acts to Promote Strong Families, Safe Children
01 February 2002	President Names New Faith-Based & Community Initiatives Director The Roosevelt Room
07 February 2002	President's Remarks at National Prayer Breakfast Washington Hilton Hotel; Washington, D.C.
07 February 2002	President Bush, Sen Lieberman Discuss Armies of Compassion The Oval Office
26 February 2002	President Announces Welfare Reform Agenda St. Luke's Catholic Church; Washington, D.C.
09 April 2002	President Outlines Principles for Public Service Klein Auditorium; Bridgeport, Connecticut
11 April 2002	President Promotes Faith-Based Initiative The East Room
29 April 2002	President Speaks to Community Leaders in Los Angeles First African Methodist Episcopal Renaissance Center; Los Angeles, California
11 June 2002	Remarks by the President Via Satellite to the Southern Baptist Convention 2002 Annual Meeting Dwight D. Eisenhower Office Building, Room 459

Table D.1: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative (Continued)

Date	Speech
02 July 2002	President Emphasizes Need for Welfare Reform Remarks by the President on Faith-Based Welfare Initiative Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ; Milwaukee, Wisconsin
12 December 2002	President Bush Implements Key Elements of his Faith-Based Initiative Downtown Marriott Hotel; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
10 February 2003	President Bush Discusses Faith-Based Initiative in Tennessee Opryland Hotel; Nashville, Tennessee
16 July 2003	President Bush Discusses Faith-Based Initiative with Urban Leaders Remarks by the President to Urban Leaders Dwight D.C. Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Room 450
28 July 2003	President Addresses Urban League Remarks by the President to the 2003 Urban League Conference David Lawrence Convention Center; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
12 September 2003	President Discusses Faith-Based Initiative at Power Center Celebration Remarks by the President at the Power Center 10th Anniversary Celebration Power Center Houston, Texas
08 October 2003	President Bush Proclaims October Domestic Violence Awareness Month Remarks by the President on Domestic Violence Prevention The East Room
29 October 2003	President Discusses Faith-Based Initiative at Youth Education Center Remarks by the President at the Dedication of the Oak Cliff Bible Fellowship Youth Education Center Dallas, Texas
15 January 2004	President Speaks with Faith-Based and Community Leaders Remarks by the President to Faith-Based and Community Leaders Union Bethel Ame Church; New Orleans, Louisiana
23 January 2004	President Bush Speaks with Nation's Mayors at Winter Meeting Remarks by the President to the U.S. Conference of Mayors Capital Hilton Hotel; Washington, D.C.
23 February 2004	Remarks by the President to the National Governors Association State Dining Room
03 March 2004	President's Remarks at Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Conference Los Angeles Convention Center; Los Angeles, California

Table D.1: Bush's First Term Speeches Regarding the Faith-Based Initiative (Continued)

Date	Speech
11 March 2004	Remarks Via Satellite by the President to the National Association of Evangelicals Convention The Map Room
01 June 2004	America's Compassion in Action Remarks by the President at the First White House National Conference on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Washington Hilton and Towers; Washington, D.C.
15 June 2004	President's Remarks Via Satellite to the Southern Baptist Convention
21 June 2004	Remarks by the President in a Conversation on Compassion Adas Center; Cincinnati, Ohio
23 June 2004	President Bush Discusses HIV/AIDS Initiatives in Philadelphia Remarks by the President on Compassion and HIV/AIDS People for People Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
16 July 2004	President Announces Initiatives to Combat Human Trafficking Tampa Marriott Waterside Hotel; Tampa, Florida
23 July 2004	President Emphasizes Minority Entrepreneurship at Urban League Remarks by the President to the 2004 National Urban League Conference Detroit Marriott Renaissance Hotel; Detroit, Michigan
03 August 2004	President Discusses Compassionate Conservative Agenda in Dallas Remarks by the President to the 122nd Knights of Columbus Convention Hyatt Regency Dallas; Dallas, Texas

Appendix E: Organizations Mentioned in Sample

The following table lists the organizations, primarily faith-based, that President Bush mentions in the sample I used for this study. Not all of the organizations listed here are necessarily supported through the faith-based initiative; some are federal. Some organizations are simply mentioned by President Bush as being contributors—social entrepreneurs—to providing humanitarian aid. This is important because it reveals that, while Bush proclaims the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives is to serve all sorts of institutions, those he mentions most frequently and those who get the most money from the federal government, are Christian organizations. Beside the date of the speech you will find one or more of the following designations, meaning President Bush attended an event hosted by a particular group (a), mentioned a group (m), and/or visited a group (v).

Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample

Name of Organization	Speech Date
Access to Recovery	01 June 2004 (m)
ACT; Cincinnati, OH	21 June 2004 (m)
Amachi Program; Philadelphia, PA	25 June 2001 (m) 12 December 2002 (m) 16 July 2003 (m)
American Dream Downpayment Fund	09 June 2001 (m)
America's Promise	09 July 2001 (a)
America's Second Harvest	11 April 2002 (m)
AmeriCorps	09 April 2002 (m)
Associated Black Charities of Baltimore; Baltimore, MD	23 July 2004 (m)

Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample (Continued)

Name of Organization	Speech Date
Beit T'Shuvah	03 March 2004 (m)
Big Brothers/Big Sisters	02 July 2001 (m)
Black Ministerial Alliance; Boston, MA	23 July 2004 (m)
Bradley Foundation	02 July 2002 (m)
Bright Hope Baptist Church; Philadelphia, PA	12 December 2002 (m, v) 16 July 2003 (m)
Brighton Rock AME Church	09 July 2001 (m)
Builders of Hope; Dallas, TX	29 October 2003 (m)
Business Strengthening America	08 October 2003 (m)
Campus for Human Development	10 February 2003 (m)
Catholic Charities	16 July 2004 (m)
Catholic Charity Services	24 May 2001 (m)
Catholic Social Agency; Allentown, PA	01 June 2004 (m)
Celebrate Recovery	03 March 2004 (m)
Center for the Homeless	21 May 2001 (m)
Challenger Boys and Girls Clubs	29 April 2002 (m)
Charles Street AME Church	10 February 2003 (m)
Chicago Christ Church of Oak Brook	10 February 2003 (m)
Christ Community Church; Franklin, TN	10 February 2003 (m)
City Center Ministries; Jacksonville, FL	16 July 2003 (m)
Citizen Corps	09 April 2002 (m)
Commonwealth Catholic Charities; Richmond, VA	01 June 2004 (m)
Corporate Alliance to End Partner Violence	08 October 2003 (m)
Corporation for National and Community Service	09 April 2002 (m)
Covenant House	16 July 2004 (m)
Crystal Cathedral	03 March 2004 (m)
East Capitol Center for Change	26 February 2002 (m)

Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample (Continued)

Name of Organization	Speech Date
Exodus Transitional Community; East Harlem, NY	16 July 2003 (m) 12 September 2003 (m)
Faith Walk Center; Dallas, TX	29 October 2003 (m)
Fellowship Christian Academy; Dallas, TX	29 October 2003 (m)
First African Methodist Episcopal (Renaissance Center)	29 April 2002 (v)
First Evangelist Church	15 January 2004 (m)
First Missionary Baptist Church (TN)	10 February 2003 (m)
Fishing School, The; Washington, D.C.	03 March 2004 (m)
Foster Grandparent Program	09 April 2002 (m)
Foundation America	02 July 2002 (m)
Frederick Douglas Community Development Corporation; Rochester, NY	16 July 2003 (m)
Front Porch Alliance; Indianapolis, IN	25 June 2001 (m)
Grace Episcopal Church; Plainfield, New Jersey	14 March 2001 (a, v)
Greater Exodus Baptist Church	04 July 2001 (m, v) 23 June 2004 (v)
Goodwill Industries	02 July 2002 (m)
Gospel Rescue Ministries; Washington D.C.	01 June 2004 (m)
Habitat for Humanity	21 May 2001 (m) 05 June 2001 (a, v) 09 June 2001 (m) 08 August 2001 (a, m, v)
Hillel Hebrew Academy Choir	03 March 2004 (m)
Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ	02 July 2002 (a, v)
Howard Johnson's	09 July 2001 (m)
Inroads	28 July 2003 (m)
Interfaith Human Services Agency; Pittsburgh, PA	28 July 2003 (m)
International Home Build	08 August 2001 (m)
Jesus School	04 July 2001 (m)

Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample (Continued)

Name of Organization	Speech Date
Judah International; Brooklyn, NY	01 June 2004 (m)
Kiwanis	02 July 2001 (m)
Knights of Columbus; Dallas, TX	03 August 2004 (v)
Lawndale Community Church	10 February 2003 (m)
Lions	02 July 2001 (m)
Memorial AME Zion Church; Rochester, NY	16 July 2003 (m)
Metro Denver Black Church Initiative	23 July 2004 (m)
Metropolitan Council on Jewish Poverty	02 July 2002 (m) 12 December 2002 (m)
Missionaries of Charity	03 August 2004 (m)
Mother Teresa Day Shelter; Corpus Christi, TX	03 August 2004 (m)
National Leadership of Hispanic Faith-Based Organizations	22 May 2001 (a)
National Urban League	28 July 2003 (m) 23 July 2004 (v)
New Hope Academy	10 February 2003 (m)
North Church; Boston, MA	16 July 2003 (m)
North Hills Community Outreach; Pittsburgh, PA	28 July 2003 (m)
Oak Cliff Bible Fellowship Youth Education Center; Dallas, TX	29 October 2003 (v) 01 June 2004 (m)
Operation Hope	03 March 2004 (m)
Operation New Hope; Jacksonville, FL	16 July 2003 (m)
Optimists	02 July 2001 (m)
Orange County Rescue Mission; Tustin, CA	29 October 2003 (m)
Peace Corps	09 April 2002 (m)
People for People; Philadelphia, PA	23 June 2004 (v)
Power Center; Houston, TX	12 September 2003 (v)
Prayer Warriors	12 September 2003 (m)
Project Turn-Around; Dallas, TX	29 October 2003 (m)

Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample (Continued)

Name of Organization	Speech Date
Public Allies	02 July 2002 (m)
Reach Out clinic; Uganda	23 June 2004 (m)
Rosedale Park Baptist Church; Detroit, MI	25 June 2001 (m)
Rose of Sharon Missionary Baptist Church; Houston, TX	12 September 2003 (m)
Rotarians	02 July 2001 (m)
Saddleback Church; Lake Forest, CA	01 June 2004 (m)
Safe Haven Interfaith Partnership Against Domestic Violence; Boston, MA	08 October 2003 (m)
Salvation Army	25 June 2001 (m) 12 September 2003 (m)
San Diego Family Justice Center; San Diego, CA	08 October 2003 (m)
Save the Children	09 April 2002 (m)
Seattle Hebrew Academy; Seattle, WA	16 July 2003 (m)
Senior Corps	09 April 2002 (m)
Set Free Indeed; Baton Rouge, LA	15 January 2004 (m) 01 June 2004 (m)
Shelter for Battered Women and Their Children; Baton Rouge, LA	15 January 2004 (m)
Silloam Ministries	23 June 2004 (m)
Sojourner House; Pittsburgh, PA	28 July 2003 (m)
So Others Might Eat	20 November 2001 (a)
South Bend's Center for the Homeless	21 May 2001 (m)
South End Community Center	09 April 2002 (m)
Southern Baptist Convention	11 June 2002 (a)
Stand for Africa Campaign; Philadelphia, PA	23 June 2004 (m)
St. Augustine Parish/Our Lady of Angeles-St. Joseph Center; Cleveland, Ohio	24 May 2001 (a, v)
St. Francis House Homeless Shelter	12 December 2002 (m)
St. Luke's Catholic Church	26 February 2002 (a, v)

Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample (Continued)

Name of Organization	Speech Date
St. Stephen's Community House; Columbus, OH	16 July 2003 (m)
Talbert House; Cincinnati, OH	21 June 2004 (m)
Trinity United Methodist; Washington DC	01 June 2004 (m)
Trotter's Restaurant	09 July 2001 (m)
Union Bethel Ame Church; New Orleans, LA	15 January 2004 (v)
Union Rescue Mission; Los Angeles, CA	03 March 2004 (m)
United Way	11 April 2002 (m)
University of Kentucky, College of Dentistry	09 July 2001 (m)
University of Notre Dame; Notre Dame, Indiana	21 May 2001 (a, v)
Uplife 4th Ward; Houston, TX	12 September 2003 (m)
Urban League of Pittsburgh	28 July 2003 (m)
USAID	01 June 2004 (m)
USA Freedom Corps (federal)	01 February 2002 (m) 26 February 2002 (m) 09 April 2002 (m) 12 December 2002 (m)
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	01 June 2004 (m)
U.S. Dream Academy; Columbia, MD	01 June 2004 (m)
Victory Center Rescue Mission	12 December 2002 (m)
Welcome Home Ministries	03 March 2004 (m)
Wellesley Congregational Church	10 February 2003 (m)
Wendy's Restaurants	17 January 2002 (m)
Windsor Village United Methodist Church; Houston, TX	12 September 2003 (m) 15 January 2004 (m)
Youth Education for Tomorrow	04 July 2001 (m)
Youth Entertainment Academy	14 March 2001 (a, v)

Table E.1: Organizations Mentioned by Bush in this Sample (Continued)

Name of Organization	Speech Date
Youth Leadership Academy	02 July 2002 (m)
Youth Leadership Team	09 July 2001 (m)