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Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the very public religiosity of the current President of the United States of America, George W Bush, and to determine if his personal religious views have shaped his political choices. In order to achieve this, it is first necessary to define the methodology that will be used to determine if religious influence is present and this will be defined with reference to the religious character, political aims and public faces of the American evangelical movement. To this end, the first chapter will give a brief history of evangelical Christianity, focusing on its defining characteristics, political efforts and the major players in the movement and thus will identify the main political concerns of this group since the 1970s. Chapter Two will present a brief biography of Bush, concentrating on his religious background, public demonstrations of his religious beliefs, encounters with the political muscle of the Religious Right and his stances on the issues identified as concerns of evangelical Christians. This will be performed in order to demonstrate Bush’s identification with evangelical Christianity, the importance of religion to him and his experience dealing with the Religious Right in the field of politics up until the end of his second term as Governor of Texas. In Chapter Three, some of the significant policies and rhetoric of Bush’s first presidential campaign and term in the White House will be examined in order to demonstrate if and in what ways Bush’s personal religious opinions have influenced his political decisions while president. It will also make a brief effort to examine some other possible influences on Bush’s political decisions. Finally, the concluding chapter will convincingly demonstrate that Bush has been influenced by his personal religious views throughout his political career and the policy areas in which this influence has occurred.

However, before this argument can commence, several important comments must first be made, all of them related to the contemporary nature of the events and materials analysed in this thesis and the implications of this on the expectations of the work that can be presented here. The first concerns the primary sources used and why, extensive use will be made of electronic resources, especially when dealing with Bush’s presidential actions, because, in almost all cases, this type of resource is not only the most accessible but also the most accurate, especially when care is taken to ensure the reliability of these sources as has been done throughout this thesis. In addition to this, electronic resources were also often the most contemporary and in many cases the only available source of material. As regards secondary sources another significant obstacle was encountered, due to the fact that the vast majority of comprehensive secondary source material concerning an

---

1 Just a quick note on terminology, hereafter George W Bush will simply be referred to as Bush while any mention of his father George Bush, will use both his Christian and surname to avoid confusion between the two, especially in Chapter Two.
2 Please note that due to the conclusion of Bush’s second presidential campaign close to the submission date for this paper, it was simply not possible to study it here, thus the focus simply on Bush’s first presidential campaign and term only.
American political administration is generally not written until after the president has left office, not a great deal of helpful information related to some sections of this thesis was available. In many cases, due to restrictions on the release of some primary sources, many truly insightful and valuable studies of past presidents have not been written until several decades after they have left office. Also, often the only secondary source material available about a President while in office is usually heavily biased in order to either make a President and his actions appear more acceptable to the public, so that they will vote for him, or expose the ‘real’ facts about a President or a course of action he has taken, so the public will not vote for him. This is another issue that has been taken into account when using this type of source here. Another problem must be mentioned here, the abundance of information available for this thesis from the media, which unfortunately does little to fill the gap usually satisfied by secondary sources. As such, it has become very clear that there is no shortage of policies or rhetoric that could be examined and it is for this reason, as well as a desire to make this thesis self contained and coherent, that only a small number of Bush’s political opinions and decisions will be discussed. Furthermore, no attempt will be made to include the most recent developments in American politics, instead the focus has been placed on several key policies and issues and these have been identified in Chapter One. Those chosen fulfilled two main criteria, it could be demonstrated that they were of interest to conservative evangelicals and there was sufficient information available to examine them in some depth. Specifically, the policies and rhetoric concerning faith based programs, protection of religious liberty, social issues and foreign policy will be examined. These three issues particularly highlight the problem of researching a current political figure, the lack of accurate, complete, concise and unbiased information upon which to base a serious academic study of a figure such as an incumbent president.

Finally, it must also be mentioned that politics in America is highly influenced by religious elements or what some scholars call ‘civil religion’. Civil religion can be defined as

\[ a \text{ set of cultural symbols that draw connections between a nation and some conception of the sacred. These symbols usually consist of beliefs and practices that make explicit reference to a divine being.} \]

As such then, any attempt to categorize Bush’s religious influences must recognise that the influence of religion on an individual’s policies and rhetoric must be more overt than simply reflecting American civil religion for it to be successfully argued that Bush’s religious beliefs affects his politics. Since the concern here is to examine how Bush’s political philosophy has been influenced by his religious affiliations, it should be readily apparent that this examination is not really concerned with how civil religion is manifest in Bush’s public actions. This is because civil


religion is mainly concerned with the public performance of politics, whereas this study is not examining the performance element as such but the content. While it could be said that a politician’s public performance does have an influence on the content of what he says, this influence is not to the extent as to create new opinions but merely to modify existing ones. Bush’s need to communicate to the public may cause him to emphasise certain features of his rhetoric, but it does not change the meaning of what he says. Therefore, the examination of Bush’s rhetoric conducted here will by necessity be brief and will speak of his language in the context of his actions. However, before the study of Bush himself can begin, it is first necessary to define the categorizations used in this paper.
Chapter 1

This chapter will concentrate on the evangelical Christian movement in the United States of America from the 1970s to the present. In particular, it will examine some very specific features of the group, what makes evangelical Christianity evangelical, its involvement in politics and the aims of that involvement and therefore will in no way attempt to give a complete account of the movement. Concerning the first, five key areas of evangelical Christianity will be examined, denominations that are recognised as evangelical in nature, particular activities and beliefs that are standard practice amongst evangelicals, the language that evangelical Christians use to describe themselves and their faith, identifiable figures who are considered evangelicals and evangelical organizations. Thus by examining these particular features of evangelical Christianity, it will be possible to categorise people who fit this pattern as evangelical Christians, and the reason that such a wide criterion has been chosen rather than the more specific classifications used by most scholars, will be discussed below. Furthermore, the examination of evangelical individuals and organizations will specifically focus on politically involved individuals and activist groups, with a more in depth analysis of the concerns and aims of such individuals and groups occurring later in the chapter.

However, to open the study, there will first be some broad remarks on definitional issues and a brief overview of evangelical Christianity in general.

Defining what constitutes evangelical Christianity and the political position of evangelical Christians is not as easy as many would assume. The first problem is that many evangelical Christians do not categorise themselves as evangelicals and must therefore be identified by certain practices that are said to be associated with this type of faith, namely membership of an evangelical denomination or church, belief in the literal truth of the Bible and the use of the phrase “born again” to describe their personal relationship with God. However, at the same time, it is admitted that this
definition both includes Christians that are not evangelical and excludes those that are, making it not particularly useful. Furthermore, evangelical Christianity is acknowledged by scholars to consist of several main subgroups, neo-evangelicals, fundamentalists, charismatics and pentecostals meaning that there is diversity across the movement as a whole. It would appear that many scholars are attempting to treat evangelical Christianity as a discrete group that can be identified by denomination or church, certain attitudes to the Bible and self categorisation as a born again Christian as opposed to the reality of a somewhat disparate movement to which people subscribe to the practices and beliefs of in varying degrees and across formal institutional boundaries. This idea is confirmed by evangelical Christian conceptions of church as a place of worship rather than a place of conversion, demonstrating that doctrine is not as important as practice and that church services are simply one aspect of an individual’s religious life. While this may capture the reality of evangelical Christianity more accurately, at the same time it makes it extremely difficult to classify someone as an evangelical. Perhaps instead the attempt should be to identify those who are sympathetic to defining features of evangelical Christianity but again, the problem of how to define these features remains. However, for our purposes and subject matter, studies into how evangelical Christians define themselves and the commonly agreed upon criteria of scholars, with some extensions, will suffice. Here, a five stage definition of an evangelical Christian is developed, one that includes denominational affiliation but recognises the problems of over emphasising this aspect, relies on an individual’s participation in certain practices and beliefs that are considered


Kellstedt, loc. cit., pp. 276, 279, 282; Wilcox et al., loc. cit., pp. 78, 91.

Ammerman, “North American Protestant Fundamentalism”, loc. cit., pp. 2-4; Brewer, op. cit., pp. 14, 16; Corbett and Corbett, op. cit., p. 367; Fowler and Hertzke, op. cit., pp. 37-8, 137, 150; Himmelstein, “Conservatism”, loc. cit., p. 181; Himmelstein, To the Right, op. cit., pp. 113-4; Layman, op. cit., pp. 81-2; Marsden, loc. cit., p. 190; Rose, loc. cit., p. 453; Utter and Storey, op. cit., p. xii; Wald, “Assessing the Religious Factor”, loc. cit., p. 107; Wilcox et al., loc. cit., p. 73. Note that the term “neo-evangelical” has been used and will continue to be used to describe one of the subgroups of evangelical Christianity in order to avoid confusion between the name of the subgroup and the descriptor of the group as a whole, and this is a distinction used by other authors, for example see Hendershot, op. cit., p. 26; Himmelstein, “Conservatism”, loc. cit., p. 184; Himmelstein, To the Right, op. cit., p. 114; Marsden, loc. cit., p. 194; Rose, loc. cit., p. 453.


Aronson, op. cit.; Hendershot, op. cit., p. 77.
evangelical due to their significance to evangelicals, focuses on the use of a specific style of language to describe one’s faith that is unique to evangelical Christianity and recognises the importance of an individual’s sympathy with the opinions of people and organisations that are universally acknowledged to be evangelical. The reason why such a broad definition has been chosen is due to the inherent problems with identifying where political figures stand on any issue. Since a politician retains their office by appealing to the largest possible number of voters for the greatest amount of time, they are highly unlikely to do or say anything to jeopardize this relationship and in particular, Republican politicians in America need to simultaneously appeal to two very different voting blocs, conservatives and moderates, in order to win elections. Concerning Bush specifically, it has been claimed that he is in fact a moderate Republican that merely appears to be highly conservative in order to secure party nominations, demonstrating the importance of catering to his ideological vagueness. Therefore, by using a wide definition of what constitutes evangelical Christianity, it will be possible to classify individuals such as Bush, who attempt to simultaneously assert and obscure their religious affiliations, as evangelicals. Furthermore, by virtue of the fact that the purpose of this chapter is to lay the groundwork necessary to classify an evangelical as such and define the evangelical political agenda, the five areas discussed here will inevitably focus only on elements necessary to achieve this as well as providing a description of the political goals of the public face of the evangelical movement.

It is also necessary to make some other clarifying remarks concerning the terms used throughout this paper. Wherever possible, the terms “evangelical” or “evangelical Christian” will be used to describe the type of Christianity discussed but a more diverse collection of terms will be used to describe this group as a political entity. When referring to evangelical Christians as a collective political force, the terms “Christian Right”, “Religious Right”, “Christian conservatives” and “conservative evangelicals” as well as some variations on these expressions will be used. In addition, a clarification between the two entities just mentioned is required. It should at all times be kept in mind that the public and political faces of the evangelical movement that constitute the Christian Right are not synonymous with all evangelical Christians or all of their political opinions. Numerous studies into the political behaviour of evangelical Christians as a whole indicates that the leaders of the Religious Right do not in any way speak for all evangelical Christians on all matters and should therefore at no point be assumed to represent all of the political concerns of this group.

---

At best, the Christian Right represents the conservative attitudes of highly involved members of evangelical Christianity and as such allies itself with the Republicans, having become a core constituency of the party.\textsuperscript{9} Also, because of the diverse nature of this group, encompassing fundamentalists, pentecostals, charismatics and neo-evangelicals, many different conceptions of the worth of the political process itself exists within the movement. While some see involvement in politics as an extension of witnessing their faith and thus essential to their religious identity, others see participation as at best a waste of time and at worst a source of corruption to their way of life.\textsuperscript{10}

Perhaps most interesting for our purposes here, is that some also believe that attitudes in the community must change before the social aims of the evangelical movement can be achieved, an attitude which, as shall be seen in Chapters Two and Three, Bush shares on some issues.\textsuperscript{11}

However, this diversity may in fact be more helpful to this study than may first appear in the sense that by being the politically visible aspect of conservative evangelical Christianity, the Christian Right defines to other political entities, such as aspiring office holders, what many evangelicals desire from the political process. While this definition may or may not be accurate is not really the point, if a candidate for office emphasises certain aspects of their political proposals in such a way as to appease the Religious Right, then their politics has been influenced by evangelical Christianity. Furthermore, if they also subscribe to the evangelical brand of Christianity and thus shape a political agenda that is in agreement with the demands of their co-religionists, then it is


\textsuperscript{11} Hendershot, op. cit., p. 9.
possible to claim that their faith has influenced their political decisions.\footnote{12} This is the reason why the last two categories, individuals and organizations, were added to the defining characteristics of evangelical Christianity, mainly to facilitate an understanding of the political goals of the Christian Right. So it is a connection between personal religious beliefs and public political decisions that is the focus of this thesis and in order to achieve this, a brief overview of the evangelical Christian movement since the 1970s, highlighting its political aspects, will now be presented.

Most scholars trace the emergence of the Christian Right as a political force to the 1970s for two main reasons, the election of Jimmy Carter as President and political and social events of the period. To begin with, Carter publicly described himself as a born again Christian, a label that, as shall be seen below, is also claimed by many evangelicals, and it is widely thought that they engaged in the political process in order to elect one of their own.\footnote{13} However, it is believed that this engagement was encouraged by the emergence of several contentious political and social issues. On the judicial front, the Supreme Court made several rulings in this period that many evangelicals disagreed with and these included rulings against restrictive prohibitions on abortion in \textit{Roe versus Wade}, against prayer in public schools in \textit{Engel versus Vitale} and the removal of tax exempt status from religious schools such as Bob Jones University in \textit{Bob Jones University versus United States}.\footnote{14}

\footnote{12} Please note that the issue of the place of religious beliefs in making political decisions in a liberal democracy is not one that will be discussed here simply because it is beyond the scope of this work. As such then, no judgements of the appropriateness or inappropriateness of a political figure making policy decisions based on their religious beliefs will be made. This is not to say that this is not an important issue, just that it is one better left to political philosophers and scientists. Furthermore, the later discussion of the political goals of the Christian Right will also avoid the larger issue of church-state relations in America in general as it too is felt to be slightly off topic as although it also provides reasons for certain political positions, it contributes little to determining what those positions are.


Further concerning the place of religion in public schools, other rulings such as *Abington Township versus Schempp*, *Epperson versus Arkansas*, *Stone versus Graham*, *Wallace versus Jaffree*, *Edwards versus Aguillard* and *Lee versus Weisman* gradually removed virtually any way that prayer or meditation could be legally performed in public schools under the auspices of school authorities, forced public schools to teach evolution rather than creation science to students and forbade the display of religious teachings or symbols in public schools. As far as legislation is concerned, it was also at this time that Congress was debating the proposed Equal Rights Amendment, a constitutional amendment that would have enshrined the equal rights of women in the constitution, but was ultimately defeated. Many of these legislative and judicial innovations were the result of a period which saw the development of new social movements including feminism, the sexual revolution, affirmative action and the gay rights movement and they are all thought to have contributed to the increased political visibility of conservative evangelical Christians due to their opposition to these social agendas. Finally, the involvement of other religious figures in the civil rights movement is also seen as contributing to a favourable environment for the entrance of evangelical ministers into the political process. The importance of these motivating factors to the re-emergence of evangelicals on the political scene will be seen later, as these issues have and continue to influence the Christian Right political agenda.

Turning now to a discussion of how to identify an evangelical Christian in a somewhat round-about way, it was mentioned at the start of this paper that an examination of five specific areas of evangelical Christianity would assist in the achievement of a working definition. The five areas mentioned were denomination, religious practices and beliefs, the language used to describe one’s faith, prominent evangelicals and evangelical organizations.

---


Beginning with denomination, the consensus among academics is that evangelicals usually belong to Pentecostal-Holiness or Charismatic, Baptist, Reformed-Confessional, Anabaptist or unaffiliated churches and denominations. However, this is often not a complete or useful understanding of how evangelical Christianity interacts with formal religious institutions. Returning to an issue mentioned in passing above, it was noted that there were several subgroups of evangelicals and briefly, one of the primary differences between two of them, neo-evangelicals and fundamentalists is concerned with one of the defining characteristics of fundamentalism trans-religiously, the issue of separation. From the 1920s to the 1960s, while fundamentalists were busy establishing their own separate denominations and institutions, many neo-evangelicals chose to remain within mainline Protestant denominations but still shared similar religious views with fundamentalists, while others followed fundamentalists in forming new churches. The goal of the neo-evangelicals who remained behind became one of changing the mainline denominations from within and they established The National Association of Evangelicals in 1941 to speak for and to neo-evangelicals of both types. In addition, the presence of neo-evangelicals within the mainline denominations has been evident in the polarisation of these denominations along liberal and conservative lines and the accommodation of differing theological opinions within mainline churches. What this demonstrates is that it is not enough to attempt to determine the evangelical status of an individual based on their denominational affiliation, as a large number of evangelicals can still be found in non-evangelical denominations and if nothing else, this has demonstrated the need for a more comprehensive classification scheme to determine if someone is in fact an evangelical Christian. Thus an evangelical Christian may attend an evangelical church, that is one affiliated with one of the families of denominations mentioned above, but at the bare minimum must attend a Protestant church sympathetic to the beliefs and practices of evangelical Christianity. This leads to the question of what evangelical beliefs and practices are and this is an issue that will now be examined in some detail.

23 Himmelstein, “Conservatism”, loc. cit., p. 185; Marsden, loc. cit., p. 192; Wilcox et al., loc. cit., p. 77.
Moving on to common evangelical beliefs and practices, these include specific attitudes to the Bible, the role of Jesus and the place of religion in one’s life. As was noted earlier in this chapter, belief in the truth of the Bible is usually a key element in any attempt to define evangelical Christianity and the Bible is often used by the Christian Right to justify their political opinions. For example, conservative evangelical opposition to abortion is based on verses such as *Exodus* 21: 22-3 and *Psalms* 139: 13 and 15-6, while opposition to homosexuality is based on *Genesis* 19:1-25, *Leviticus* 18:22 and 20:13, *Romans* 1:26-7, 1 *Corinthians* 6:9 and 1 *Timothy* 1:10. In general, evangelicals view the Bible as an ethical sourcebook on how to lead a Christian life. However, there are disputes about the correct interpretation of the above passages and in fact the Bible as a whole amongst evangelicals. These conflicts should probably be considered specific examples of the relatively small differences of opinion about how the Bible should be viewed by different types of evangelicals. Again these differing attitudes underscore the difference between neo-evangelicals and fundamentalists, the latter hold the Bible to be literally true while the former are a little more flexible, merely believing it to be inerrant, and this represents the distinction between perceiving the Bible to be the literal word of God as opposed to the inspired word of God.

Another criterion often used to classify someone as an evangelical is their claim to have personally accepted Jesus as their saviour, also mentioned above. Usually, but not always, this means that evangelicals will call themselves “born again” but may also use terms such as “saved” to describe their relationship with God. In addition to this, there are several different categories of born again experience, a specific moment, a status or a process. For the first, there is a moment at which one can identify when they were born again and this is usually a time when they consciously chose to accept Jesus as their personal saviour. The second is where the status of being saved is associated with the witnessing of one’s beliefs and is not necessarily associated with evangelical Christianity, an issue that will be returned to shortly. The last indicates an extended period of time during which an individual gradually accepts Jesus as their saviour and this can occur both within

---

30 Hendershot, op. cit., p. 60; Jelen et al., loc. cit., p. 200; Kellstedt, loc. cit., p. 288.
31 Jelen et al., loc. cit., p. 200; Kellstedt, loc. cit., p. 288.
and outside formal Christian mechanisms. If nothing else, this demonstrates the problematic aspects of defining evangelicals simply as born again Christians, instead the focus should probably be on the individual having a personal relationship with Jesus, the essential element of this experience for evangelicals. So, anyone who claims to have been born again must have their conception of what constitutes a born again experience examined in order to determine whether they have been born again in the sense implied by evangelical Christianity.

Not only is it vital to evangelical Christianity that an individual have a personal relationship with God, but it is also necessary to announce this status to others or “witness” in order to help them achieve the same state. A more detailed examination of what is involved in witnessing will occur below when how evangelicals speak about their faith is discussed, however perhaps such beliefs should be viewed in relation to religious participation. Evangelicals usually practice a high maintenance style of religion, that is one in which faith and its practices are placed at the centre of one’s life. Consequently, they exhibit an elevated level of personal devotion such as Bible reading, prayer and witnessing their faith in order to convert people to evangelical Christianity. But these are by no means all of the common beliefs and practices to which evangelicals subscribe. One of the more interesting, and problematic, is the eschatological convictions of some evangelicals that will be discussed in relation to certain individuals shortly and once again, there are considerable variations in these ideas as well. Briefly, these concern predictions about the End Times derived from the Revelation According to John, when born again Christians will be raptured to Heaven before the Second Coming of Christ, the Rapture being followed by the Tribulation, or the last years before Christ’s return in which the Antichrist will rule on earth, and this will be signalled by the End Times, a period of increasing world centralisation, moral decline, the return of the Jewish people to Israel and conflict in the Middle East. It could be argued that these eschatological ideas are merely a result of evangelical attitudes to the Bible, however it must be remembered that these ideas are not universal to all evangelicals. Still, the beliefs and practices discussed here represent

33 Jelen et al., loc. cit., pp. 201-2.
35 Aronson, op. cit.; Garvey, loc. cit., p. 39; Green et al., loc. cit., p. 253; Hendershot, op. cit., pp. 4, 50; Lincoln, op. cit., p. 44.
the core of evangelical Christianity and will be examined in more detail with a discussion of the major figures of conservative evangelicalism, after a brief analysis of the language evangelicals use to describe their faith.

Central to any conception of religious identity is how an individual describes their faith and at the beginning of this chapter, it was mentioned how difficult it is to determine if an evangelical Christian is in fact an evangelical Christian as many do not claim the label. However, by expanding this idea to more lengthy descriptions of how evangelicals speak about their religion, several common and essential elements emerge. First among these is that many, but not all, evangelicals will describe themselves as “born again” or use other similar terms such as “saved”, as was mentioned above. Related to this is the importance of explaining this relationship with God to others or “witnessing”, which was also mentioned above. Evangelicals will often explain how they found Jesus, highlighting how terrible their life was before their born again experience and how much better their life has become since then, or they may focus on the need of their audience to personally accept Jesus in order to avoid eternal damnation.39 Important to this salvation narrative are certain words and phrases used to describe elements of it, there is often talk of “planting a mustard seed” in those who are “searching” that leads them to a closer “relationship” with God enabling them to “walk the walk”.40 It is the use of these words and phrases by people speaking about their faith that can be used to identify them as evangelical Christians. This idea can be expanded to an individual’s support for prominent exponents of the evangelical faith.

Helping to identify the defining aspects of evangelicalism are the public figures of the movement who are, for the most part, either ministers, the leaders of prominent organizations or in many cases both. Only a small number of the prominent individuals and groups will be examined here and they have been chosen not just because of their prominence but also due to the ease with which they could be associated with Bush, mainly due to the ready availability of information concerning these relationships, and their importance to the development of the political ideology and influence of the Christian Right.

To begin with, the Reverend Billy Graham, a Southern Baptist minister, is well known for his evangelising work and early efforts at bringing the emerging evangelical political movement of the 1970s into contact with politicians.41 In addition to this he was one of the founding figures of a major evangelical magazine, Christianity Today, and is involved in the production of other types of

40 Ibid., pp. 3, 9, 60-2.
evangelical media such as television, radio and films. He, his productions and his organisations espouse what will shortly be seen as a standard evangelical political position, anti-abortion, anti-pornography, pro-family values, pro-school prayer and pro-capital punishment and exhibits beliefs in evangelical eschatology. Proving a case in point for the diversity of political opinions amongst evangelicals, Graham has supported the Democrats and he has been an unofficial spiritual advisor to several Republican Presidents including Ronald Reagan and George Bush. Another major figure is the Reverend Jerry Falwell, an independent Baptist minister and founder of the Moral Majority, one of the best known Christian Right political organizations, a group which will be discussed below. In addition to this, he hosts the Old Time Gospel Hour television program and through the funds raised on this show constructed Liberty University and was able to launch and gather support for his political organisation. Concerning his political opinions, Falwell has repeatedly expressed his opposition to abortion, feminism, social welfare and homosexuality while calling for a return of God to public schools, family values, a strong military and media censorship and religiously, he subscribes to evangelical eschatological beliefs concerning the End Times. The Reverend Pat Robertson has similar credentials to that of Falwell, he is also a minister, again ordained in a Baptist Church although he later renounced the position, and he too hosts a television program, called the 700 Club, which he also used as a base of support to found the Christian

Coalition, another organisation which will be discussed in more detail below. The 700 Club allowed Robertson to raise funds to found Regent University and the American Centre for Law and Justice, his answer to the American Civil Liberties Union, and unsuccessfully attempt to run for the Presidency in 1988. Robertson has repeatedly stressed the importance of traditional and conservative family values by campaigning for school prayer and educational vouchers and against gay rights, feminism, pornography and abortion, and his ownership of the Christian Broadcasting Network allows him to effectively disseminate his political views. He has also written books on evangelical eschatology and his political agenda is reflective of these opinions. Similar to both Falwell and Robertson is James Robison, he too is a Baptist minister, hosts a television program, Life Today, and was also involved in the foundation of a political organization, the Religious Roundtable. But this is not the entirety of Robison’s involvement in politics, although he does not have as high profile as Falwell or Robertson, Robison is still considered a leading figure of the Religious Right as he has extensive political and religious contacts and has spoken out against issues such as homosexuality, abortion, sex before marriage, euthanasia and feminism. Moving on to Timothy LaHaye, like Robertson, Robison and Falwell, he is also a Baptist minister and is well known for his opinions regarding homosexuality, having written a book entitled The Unhappy Gays, in addition to several other books concerning secular humanism and evangelical eschatology, and is highly involved in political activism, again focusing on homosexuality, pornography, abortion and media broadcasting standards. Secular humanism deserves some examination here as


51 Hendershot, op. cit., pp. 190-2; Jelen and Wilcox, loc. cit., p. 255; Utter and Storey, op. cit., p. 34.


53 Cohen, loc. cit., p. 2; Utter and Storey, op. cit., p. 68.

it is a common buzzword amongst the Christian Right that represents their dissatisfaction with what they see as the marginalisation of the religious and the promotion of non-religious forms of knowledge over that of the divine.\footnote{Ammerman, “North American Protestant Fundamentalism”, loc. cit., pp. 40-1; Anonymous, “Secular Humanism” in J. Schultz, J. West and I. Maclean (eds), Encyclopedia of Religion in American Politics, Phoenix, 1999, p. 223; Chidester, op. cit., p. 287; Garvey, loc. cit., p. 34; Mansfield, op. cit., p. 82; Rose, loc. cit., pp. 458-9; Utter and Storey, op. cit., pp. 6, 59; Weber and Jones, op. cit., p. xxvii.} In addition to this, LaHaye was instrumental in the foundation of the American Coalition for Traditional Values as well as several other conservative Christian organisations and his wife Beverly heads Concerned Women for America, with the latter focusing on conservative issues of interest to women, such as the traditional role of women in the family, opposition to abortion, euthanasia, sex education and promoting abstinence as the only acceptable form of contraception.\footnote{Anonymous, “Timothy LaHaye”, loc. cit., p. 142; Corbett and Corbett, op. cit., pp. 370, 372; Fowler and Hertzke, op. cit., pp. 77-8, 137, 144; Utter and Storey, op. cit., pp. 58-9, 111, 124; Weber and Jones, op. cit., pp. 66-8, 143.} On a more directly political note, individuals such as Ralph Reed, Paul Weyrich and Pat Buchanan are prominent leaders of the Christian Right and many head organizations that will be discussed in more detail shortly. Reed is best known for his highly political role in Robertson’s organization, the Christian Coalition.\footnote{Anonymous, “Ralph Reed” in J. Schultz, J. West and I. Maclean (eds), Encyclopedia of Religion in American Politics, Phoenix, 1999, p. 223; Chidester, op. cit., p. 287; Garvey, loc. cit., p. 34; Mansfield, op. cit., p. 82; Rose, loc. cit., pp. 458-9; Utter and Storey, op. cit., pp. 6, 59; Weber and Jones, op. cit., p. xxvii.} However, since leaving the Christian Coalition in the late 1990s, Reed has worked on Bush’s second gubernatorial campaign as well as both of his presidential campaigns.\footnote{Aronson, op. cit.; Corbett and Corbett, op. cit., p. 372; F. Foer, “Running on their Faith” in U.S. News & World Report, Vol. 127:22, December 6 1999, p. 26; J. Hatfield, Fortunate Son: George W. Bush and the Making of an American President, New York, 2002, p. 231; B. Minutaglio, First Son: George W. Bush and the Bush Family Dynasty, New York, 1999, p. 335.} Pat Buchanan is also famous for his political activities over and above his religious ones, becoming one of the more visible leaders of the Christian Right with his bids for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1992 and 1996, although he did begin his political career in the conservative wing of the Republican Party.\footnote{Aronson, op. cit.; Binning, “Patrick Buchanan”, loc. cit., p. 34; Hatfield, op. cit., pp. 213-4.} He has repeatedly pushed for traditional family values, in particular campaigning against abortion and gay rights and for school prayer while also espousing the standard conservative Republican position in the areas of foreign policy, economics and the role of government.\footnote{W. Binning, “Patrick Buchanan” in J. Schultz, J. West and I Maclean (eds), Encyclopedia of Religion in American Politics, Phoenix, 1999, pp. 33-4; Corbett and Corbett, op. cit., pp. 371, 373.} In this sense, Buchanan can be seen as an example of the secularisation of the Christian Right agenda in order to broaden its appeal to the electorate. Moving on to Paul Weyrich, although he is not strictly speaking a card carrying member of the Christian Right in a religious sense, he is considered instrumental in the formation of major Christian Right organizations. This is due to his involvement with secular Republican conservative
groups, the encouragement he gave to figures such as Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson to enter politics and his prominent role in the establishment of Christian Right organizations including the Moral Majority, Christian Voice and the Religious Roundtable.\textsuperscript{61} Finally and moving out of the directly political sphere, Dr James Dobson, a psychologist, is famous due to his organization, Focus on the Family, providing an alternative source of media for evangelical Christians.\textsuperscript{62} Originally the host of a radio program of the same name, Dobson has become one of the leading figures of the Christian Right due to its influence and his expansion into media production and distribution.\textsuperscript{63} His organization and how it defines and influences the concerns of conservative evangelicals will again be discussed further below, however he has personally spoken out against abortion.\textsuperscript{64} This brief examination of the major figures of evangelical Christianity has exposed the fact that there are common ideas held by these people and a discussion of their and other evangelical organizations will further highlight this political consensus among the Christian Right.

When it comes to evangelical organizations, many of the leaders of these groups were discussed in the preceding paragraph and the groups themselves and their concerns will now be examined. Essential for constructing and spreading much of the Christian Right agenda, these organizations, along with their leaders, are the public face of evangelical Christianity but do not solely consist of political interest groups. Focus on the Family, Dobson’s organization, is interesting in that it is the largest producer and distributor of media targeted at evangelical Christians.\textsuperscript{65} As such, the concerns of the media produced by Focus on the Family reflect the interests of the evangelical community, especially its political ones.\textsuperscript{66} Focus on the Family promotes ideas such as family values, chastity or abstinence through True Love Waits and other programs, the idea that homosexuality is sinful, that to have an abortion is to murder a child and opposes social movements such as feminism and affirmative action.\textsuperscript{67} More religiously focused groups include the Promise Keepers, a non-denominational evangelical group concerned with religious development for men.\textsuperscript{68} The group focuses on family values and highlights the traditional role of men in the family but does
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not promote a political agenda per se.\textsuperscript{69} Also interesting is Community Bible Study, a non-denominational evangelical national Bible study organization, in that it is seen as a supplement to the educational programs of churches and one that focused exclusively on the Bible.\textsuperscript{70} Returning to the overtly political groups, these include organizations such as the Christian Coalition, the now-defunct Moral Majority, Christian Voice and the Religious Roundtable. Falwell’s organization, the Moral Majority, promoted an agenda focused mainly on social issues such as abortion, homosexuality, family values, patriotism and limited government except in the area of defence and national security, while combating the influence of secular humanism.\textsuperscript{71} It was primarily a lobby and voter awareness group, however it was not the first lobbying organization catering for conservative evangelicals, that honour goes to Christian Voice, but it was the first group to encourage evangelicals to enrol to vote on a large scale.\textsuperscript{72} The Moral Majority was re-branded the Liberty Federation and then disbanded by Falwell in 1990, who claimed that the aims of the organization had been met, but many of its former members remain active in politics, pursuing the same goals as the Moral Majority once did.\textsuperscript{73} Christian Voice was the first organisation to issue report cards on how candidates would vote on a variety of moral issues of interest to conservative evangelicals, such as prayer in schools, abortion, gay rights, pornography, drug use and sex education, as well as some broader concerns such as taxes, free enterprise and national defence.\textsuperscript{74} Interestingly, the Christian Coalition, a second generation Religious Right organization, has through the efforts of Reed, focused more on grass roots politics, especially the election of conservative evangelicals to local positions of authority, in addition to its Washington lobbying.\textsuperscript{75} The importance of this is that in many areas, conservative evangelicals were able to gain control of local political apparatuses such as the Republican Party leadership and school boards.\textsuperscript{76} It has also de-emphasised its purely evangelical appeal in an effort to gain widespread support amongst conservatives, a strategy that has forced it to move away from some of the more radical social
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demands of the Christian Right and focus on other policy areas such as economics.\textsuperscript{77} Regardless of these minor changes to its agenda, the Christian Coalition still supports family values, educational vouchers, school prayer and local control of education while opposing abortion, the distribution of free contraceptives, pornography and national welfare and remaining strongly involved with the Republican Party.\textsuperscript{78} Alternatively, the Religious Roundtable is slightly different to the groups just discussed in that it targeted evangelicals and sympathisers within the mainline Protestant denominations and attempted to link them with major Republican political figures, but still pursued a standard conservative evangelical agenda concerned with homosexuality, abortion, prayer in schools, secular humanism and pornography.\textsuperscript{79} The above discussion of both individuals and organizations has demonstrated that the Christian Right agrees on a great deal when it comes to its political agenda and this political agenda will now be discussed.

Although some political concerns of the Religious Right have been noted in passing above, it is now time to flesh out the political desires of conservative evangelicals in some detail. It was noted above in relation to the Christian Coalition that more recent attempts by the Religious Right to influence the political process have become more secular in tone in order to build cross denominational and even cross religious support for, in particular, the Christian Right’s social agenda but social issues are by no means the entirety of the political concerns of this group. As such, the political agenda of conservative evangelicals can be divided into four main areas, welfare, religious liberty, social issues and foreign policy.

First, it should be remembered that evangelical Christians vote for Republican candidates more frequently than any other religious demographic and that, as has been noted above, early and continued support for the Christian Right comes from the Republican Party. This means that in general terms, the basic agenda of the Religious Right is essentially conservative, desiring limited government, tough penalties for crime, lower taxes, a strong national defence, an emphasis on individual responsibility, decreased judicial activism and support for free market economics.\textsuperscript{80} In

addition to this, conservative evangelicals are especially critical of welfare, advocating return to work and work for the dole schemes, harsh penalties for what is seen by them as irresponsible behaviour, such as having additional children while still on welfare, and are of the opinion that the needy should be cared for by religious institutions and not the government, meaning that the state should encourage charitable giving and support religious organisations that cater to the needy.\textsuperscript{81} This idea is related to the evangelical view that the salvation of individuals holds the key to transforming society, not attempts to change society itself.

When it comes to specifically religious issues, these encompass efforts by the Religious Right to increase the profile of religion in society and protect their religious institutions. As far as the former is concerned, most of the fighting centres on education, an issue that was mentioned earlier as an important one for evangelical Christians. The Christian Right frequently questions the place of religion in public schools, whether it be their wish for state sanctioned prayer, the right for teachers to educate students in creationism and either give equal time to or not teach evolution at all, the lack of reference to religion and morally acceptable subjects in school curriculums and textbooks and for religious education to be taught while sex education is not.\textsuperscript{82} Failing this, conservative evangelicals are active in protecting their religious institutions, again in the realm of education but also with regards to employment and their ability to freely practice their religion. Argument in this area centres on the tax exempt status of private Christian schools and whether such schools should receive government funding or parents be given assistance to send their children to religious schools, with conservative evangelicals desiring that private schools not pay tax and that the government support their decision to educate their children in a religious school by using vouchers or tax credits.\textsuperscript{83} One of the more interesting and specifically religious issues focused


on by the Christian Right concerned the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which sought to protect the rights of religious institutions that had been challenged by the Supreme Court, especially their ability to apply religious criteria to employment.\(^84\) The bill would have required the government to demonstrate a compelling interest when seeking to limit an individual’s free exercise of religion and was passed by Congress, but later overturned by the Supreme Court.\(^85\)

As to their social aims, these seem mainly concerned with promoting traditional moral ideals or “family values”, a phrase that encompasses such diverse issues as sexuality, censorship and women’s rights and is often linked to calls for spiritual renewal.\(^86\) Sexuality is the broadest area, conservative evangelicals regularly campaign against gay rights and abortion, holding related opinions against euthanasia and stem cell and genetic research, and have some rather specific opinions about contraception, promoting abstinence as the only effective and morally acceptable answer to teenage sexual activity.\(^87\) Specifically in the realm of homosexuality, they support groups, often also religious in nature, that attempt to ‘cure’ homosexuals as conservative evangelicals view sexual preference as a choice.\(^88\) They are also very vocal about drug use and push for censorship of morally objectionable material and themes, however one of the few successess of the Christian Right was in the area of women’s rights.\(^89\) In particular, this was the defeat of the Equal Rights


\(^85\) Guliuzza, loc. cit., pp. 210-1; Hofrenning, loc. cit., p. 481.


Amendment, which was opposed because they felt that it threatened the traditional family, evidence of their belief that the customary role of women as wives and mothers should be protected and promoted.\textsuperscript{90} Other attempts by the Religious Right to protect the traditional family included measures to strengthen parental control over children, encourage mothers to remain in the home and remove the marriage penalty in the tax code.\textsuperscript{91} This social agenda is particularly apparent in the response of conservative evangelicals such as Falwell and Robertson to the September 11 terrorist attacks, the attacks were described as God’s punishment on America for rejecting what they see as traditional and divinely ordained values and both expressed a hope that it would result in spiritual renewal for America.\textsuperscript{92} Specifically, Falwell said

\textit{I really believe that the pagans, and the abortionists, and the feminists, and the lesbians who are actively trying to make that an alternative lifestyle, the ACLU, People For the American Way, all of them who have tried to secularize America. I point the finger in their face and say: ‘You helped this happen’}.\textsuperscript{93}

He then went on to say

\textit{This could be, if we will fast and pray, this could be God’s call to revival.}.\textsuperscript{94}

These statements, if nothing else, demonstrate the importance of the social agenda of the Religious Right to their ideal of a Christian America.\textsuperscript{95}

In addition to this, those influenced by evangelical eschatology also promote certain foreign policy ideas that are compatible with this worldview. As was discussed in slightly more detail above, certain events are thought by eschatologically inclined evangelicals to signify the coming apocalypse. Since the Jewish people have to return to Israel, these evangelicals exhibit a great deal
of support for Israel and are very opposed to the creation of a Palestinian state. Also, institutions such as the United Nations and the World Bank are opposed and it is felt that America needs a strong military to protect itself from the centralising aims of such organizations and America’s enemies until the Rapture so that the work of saving individuals can continue.

Therefore, in order to demonstrate that a politician had been influenced by conservative evangelicals, it would be necessary to show that their political agenda has been compatible with the four areas outlined above. They would have to follow standard conservative policies but since this encompasses such a large area and is a given for any Republican, it would be sufficient that they emphasise the role of religious institutions in solving welfare issues. It would also be important for them to ensure that there is a place for religion in public schools and promote the protection of religious liberty. The articulation of a social agenda sympathetic to that of the Christian Right would also be essential, that is one that promotes decency and moral values. And finally, desirable but not completely necessary, is a foreign policy influenced by evangelical eschatology, supporting a strong military and Israel while opposing international agencies. The reason why the last of these is not completely essential is that it was noted above that such opinions are not universal to even the conservative evangelicals of the Christian Right. So, the examination of Bush’s policy proposals while Governor in Chapter Two and President in Chapter Three will concentrate on his record in the four areas of welfare, the promotion of religion in public schools and the protection of religious liberties, social issues and foreign policy. But at the beginning of this chapter, it was stated that this was only half of the connection needed to demonstrate that Bush has been influenced by his evangelical faith throughout his political career. It is also necessary to demonstrate that Bush is an evangelical Christian and this is the aim of the first half of the next chapter.


Chapter 2

This chapter will provide a brief account of Bush’s life up until the beginning of his successful Presidential campaign for 2000, concentrating on both his personal religious development, public political decisions and where the two areas overlap as defined in Chapter One. As such, it will not attempt to give a detailed biography of Bush’s life as other areas of Bush’s life are not considered relevant to the current discussion and are thus beyond the scope of this work. The purpose of this examination is to determine Bush’s past and present religious affiliations and how and when these affiliations have changed over time in order to examine his political history in the appropriate religious context. In order to achieve this, several aspects of Bush’s religious life will be discussed, including his childhood involvement in religious activities, the importance of religion to his parents, his religious practices as an adult before his re-evaluation of the role of Christianity in his life and his greater involvement in religious activities since the mid 1980s. A more in depth examination of the last of these phases of Bush’s religious life will demonstrate his affiliation with evangelical Christianity in five ways, his denominational membership, personal religious habits, public statements about his religious beliefs and experiences, spiritual advisors and support for certain types of religious organizations. This will be followed by a brief discussion of Bush’s experience with the political influence of the Religious Right in order to demonstrate that he is not only well aware of their political desires but also the importance of catering to this voting bloc. Finally, an examination of Bush’s statements and actions on the political aims of conservative evangelicals during his political experience prior to campaigning for the presidency will demonstrate where he has stood ideologically. What will become readily apparent is that Bush has a great deal of experience in campaigning, with rather less experience at governing, has in the past been affiliated with the moderate faction of the Republican Party but has appeared to moved steadily to the right in his later years and has a great deal of exposure to the power and desires of the Christian Right. Thus this chapter will attempt to answer the question of whether Bush’s politics has, in the past, been influenced by his evangelical Christian affiliations and raise the issue of whether this influence is due to personal religious belief or simply a case of giving the voters what they want. As to the latter, an examination of Bush’s personal religious development will attempt to illuminate this issue.

Bush’s involvement in religion has varied over the years, ranging from what would be considered a standard childhood participation, a period of attendance for attendance’s sake and a later active engagement with what would be considered evangelical Christian groups. From a young age Bush attended Church with his family, specifically the First Presbyterian Church of Midland in
Texas.\(^1\) His father was heavily involved in the church, as a deacon, then elder and as a Sunday school teacher, with participation in religious activities in Midland and elsewhere at that time considered as much a civic as spiritual activity.\(^2\) However, Bush was baptised in an Episcopal Church in New Haven and his parents and he returned to this denomination when the family moved to Houston in Bush’s early teenage years, choosing to worship at St Martin’s Episcopal Church, and it was here that Bush served as an altar boy.\(^3\) In addition to this, Bush’s final years of schooling at Phillips Academy at Andover required mandatory five days a week attendance at Congregational services.\(^4\) Clearly then, Bush was no stranger to Christianity in his youth and this is even more strongly indicated by the deep affinity his parents have with their faith, not only was this evident in George and Barbara Bush’s public remarks and the statements of others on this matter, but his parents often used Christian ceremonies to mark important events in their life.\(^5\) In 1975, while George Bush was in China serving as the US Ambassador, he held a special Church service to mark Independence Day, having his daughter Dorothy baptised in a non-denominational Chinese Church, a service attended by his children and foreign dignitaries.\(^6\) Also, after his Presidential election win in 1988, the family organised a private service at St Martin’s in Houston.\(^7\) Still, it is interesting to note that both George and Barbara Bush, throughout George’s political life, felt that their faith was a private matter and were often reluctant to discuss the topic publicly.\(^8\) This meant that observers often failed to recognise the importance of religion to the Bush family. However, in his early adult years, Bush drifted away from this highly religious lifestyle.

Before his active involvement in evangelical groups in the 1980s and beyond, Bush floated in and out of organised religion, mainly due to his civic responsibilities, but was not really genuinely attracted to it. On his return to Midland in 1975, Bush also returned to his childhood Church, the First Presbyterian, and, like his father, also taught Sunday School as churchgoing was

\(^7\) Mansfield, op. cit., p. 85; Minutaglio, op. cit., p. 232.
still considered as much a civic duty as a religious one.\(^9\) With his marriage in 1977, Bush became involved in the Methodist denomination, being married in, attending services and eventually teaching Sunday School at the First United Methodist Church in Midland, making the move permanent several years later after his daughters were baptised into this denomination.\(^10\) In addition to this, his wife attempted to engage Bush’s interest in religious matters by encouraging him to attend Christian seminars.\(^11\) Although he was not particularly receptive to his wife’s efforts, Bush did attend men-only prayer meetings in the late 1970s, however this was again due to societal expectations, especially in Texas, that all upstanding citizens are also avid churchgoers.\(^12\) Furthermore, Bush himself admitted that at this time in his life he was attending religious activities out of habit and the expectations of others that he do so, not because of any real commitment to his faith and this is reflected in his passive participation in religious activities such as the service his father organised in China that was mentioned above.\(^13\) Clearly then, although formally affiliated with Christianity, Bush felt and others observed that he was not truly a religious person at this time in his life.

This was followed in 1985 by a deeper affiliation with evangelical Christianity that Bush describes as a defining moment of his life and attributes to televangelist Billy Graham.\(^14\) Although Bush remained within the confines of the Methodist faith, by 1988 and with his move to Dallas with his family, the Bushes were regulars at services at the Highland Park United Methodist Church.\(^15\) This affiliation is only partially helpful in enabling one to categorise Bush as an evangelical, simply because United Methodism is considered a mainline Protestant denomination, but it does count as members people from widely different political positions.\(^16\) For example, in addition to the Republican Bush, Democrats Ann Richards, his first opponent for Governor of Texas, and Hilary Clinton are also Methodists, with the latters exhibiting a very different style of faith and politics to

---
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Bush. But it is important to remember that in Chapter One it was discovered that evangelicals could be found in any Protestant denomination. Concerning United Methodism in particular, it appears that many Methodists share similar political opinions to conservative evangelicals and the denomination is also considered particularly attractive to evangelicals on religious grounds.

Furthermore, the liberal-conservative divide that has affected all mainline Protestant denominations has been observed in United Methodism and Bush would definitely be leaning towards the latter camp for several reasons. First, as a resident of Dallas, Bush was living in an area very well known for being one of the major centres of Christian evangelicalism and this would have had an influence on how he practices his faith. Also, his choice of church, the Highland Park Methodist Church, definitely indicates evangelical leanings in his place of worship. As to the sincerity of his conversion, Bush’s willing involvement in religious matters is evident through his active participation and in many cases organization of religious events. At his father’s service after winning the Presidency, mentioned above, it was Bush who led the family in prayer and in 2001, he was named Methodist Layman of the Year by an evangelical group within the United Methodist Church. Furthermore, Bush also attended Church services before both of his gubernatorial inaugurations. Thus when Bush’s denominational affiliations are examined in conjunction with his position within the denomination, his particular choice of church, geographical location and enthusiastic personal participation, it is clear that Bush partakes of formal religious institutions that encourage evangelicalism. Bush’s evangelicalism is even more evident in his particular religious beliefs and how he expresses his faith.

What Bush personally believes has to be determined from what he says about his faith and exactly how he expresses these beliefs will be returned to shortly. Bush has been very open about his religion, not only has both of his parents described him as “born again” after his talk with Billy Graham, he himself has also claimed the label and has said that he has been saved by Jesus and accepted him as his saviour. However, as was noted in the previous chapter, there are different types of born again experiences and some further examination is necessary to determine if Bush believes himself to have been born again in the sense associated with evangelical Christianity. From what he has said about this, it appears that he conceives of it as a two stage process, a single
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moment when he realised that he wanted to be closer to God and a much longer period of spiritual development. When this born again experience is understood in conjunction with his belief in Jesus as his personal saviour, it is compatible with the events associated with evangelicalism.

Concerning his opinion of the Bible, this is an area in which either no one appears to have asked the right questions or one that Bush has been careful not to speak about publicly. He has admitted that his political decisions have been influenced by the Bible, hence the title of this thesis, and he has implied, but not stated that he considers the Bible to be a guide to life. As to Bush’s personal devotional activities, these began with him joining a men only Community Bible Study class in 1985, not long after his moment with Billy Graham. Apparently Bush has continued to read and study the Bible to the present day and he is also well known as a man who prays regularly and believes in its power. With regard to eschatology, it appears that like the Bible, Bush has said nothing directly on this issue, making it difficult to determine if he subscribes to these views. Clearly then, Bush exhibits many of the beliefs essential to evangelicalism and those that he does not demonstrate he has not explicitly denied either.

Returning to how Bush speaks about his faith, it was noted above that he makes no secret of his religious beliefs and has also described himself as very interested in the religious affiliations of others. As to what Bush has specifically said about his faith, he has repeatedly expressed his belief in God and divine providence in ways familiar to evangelicals.

26 Aronson, op. cit.; Hatfield, op. cit., p. 235.
Jesus Christ”, saying that Graham “led me to the path, and I began walking”. Bush is famous for publicly stating that he felt that only those who have accepted Jesus as their personal saviour can reach Heaven, an opinion that he subsequently and again publicly amended. What is even more interesting about this episode is that a confidant of Bush, when questioned about this episode, acknowledged that it had been a political fax pas and that Bush no longer spoke about his personal religious beliefs publicly. This may be the reason why there is no information available about Bush’s particular religious beliefs apart from his acceptance of the born again label. Also, during his Presidential campaign and term, Bush made several interesting religious statements. He named Jesus as his favourite philosopher during the campaign “because he changed my heart” and both before and after ascending to the Presidency, Bush said that he was called to the position by God. He said that “I believe that God wants me to run for president” and after September 11 asserted that “I’m here for a reason” and that “I’m in the Lord’s hands.” Also, when asked about the support his father, George Bush, was providing to him during the more difficult aspects of his presidency, Bush said

he is the wrong father to appeal to in terms of strength. There is a higher father that I appeal to.

In fact, in his first major national address, his victory speech, Bush went to great lengths to speak of religious themes:

I ask you to pray for this great nation. I ask for your prayers for leaders from both parties. I thank you for your prayers for me and my family, and I ask you to pray for Vice President

---
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When these public statements are taken in conjunction with Bush’s expressed interest in other people’s religious beliefs, it is evident that Bush is, if only subtly, witnessing his faith. Again, Bush fits the pattern of evangelicalism developed in Chapter One by witnessing his faith in terms familiar to evangelicals.

Bush’s evangelicalism is also particularly evident in his choice of spiritual advisors, who in many cases are also personal friends, and all of them can be linked with the evangelical movement, especially Billy Graham, James Robison, Ed Young and Pat Robertson. In fact, Billy Graham gave the benediction at Bush’s first inauguration as Governor of Texas and his son Franklin fulfilled the same role at Bush’s Presidential inauguration, while James Robison spoke at a prayer breakfast before one of Bush’s gubernatorial inauguratiions. Billy Graham was even the major speaker at the National Cathedral Prayer service for the September 11 terrorist attacks. It is also important to note that Bush met with many evangelical leaders while preparing for his first Presidential campaign, many of whom went on to publicly support his candidacy, including Pat Robertson, James Dobson, James Robison, Jerry Falwell and Ralph Reed. As to his support for particular types of religious organizations, these include Community Bible Study that was mentioned above, the Promise Keepers, his stated participation in Focus on the Family programs on raising children and support for Focus on the Family initiatives including True Love Waits and once again these groups are highly conservative and evangelical in nature. So, even in the secondary areas of sympathy with prominent evangelicals and evangelical organisations, Bush can be seen as supporting evangelicalism due to his close ties with both evangelical individuals and groups.

All of this demonstrates that in the mid 1980s, Bush re-examined the role of Christianity in his life and decided to pursue further religious development through mechanisms associated with evangelical Christianity. To further support this identification of Bush as an evangelical is the recognition of him as exhibiting this style of faith by others, especially fellow evangelicals. When his political experience is viewed in this light, two important aspects that will shortly be examined
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40 Bush, A Charge to Keep, op. cit., p. 6; Cohen, loc. cit., pp. 1-2; Hatfield, op. cit., p. 143; Mansfield, op. cit., p. 140; Minutaglio, op. cit., p. 300.
43 Aronson, op. cit.; Bush, A Charge to Keep, op. cit., p. 137; Hatfield, op. cit., p. 235; Maddox, loc. cit., p. 401; Mansfield, op. cit., pp. 69-70, 162.
stand out. The first is that by the time of his work with the Christian Right for his father, Bush had recently committed himself to a deeper understanding of his religion. The second is that Bush’s later gubernatorial and presidential campaigns are noteworthy due to their accommodation of the political desires of conservative evangeli
cals and experience that he had gained during his father’s Presidential campaign would have been essential in determining what those political desires were. However, perhaps the most important facet of Bush’s religious life from this point on is that he has acknowledged that his political philosophy has been influenced by his faith, what only remains for this thesis to determine is the truth and extent of this assertion.

Moving on to Bush’s political experience, it is important to recognise that he is no stranger to politics. Bush has been involved in no fewer than fifteen significant political campaigns over the years, including campaigns for his father, family members, friends of his father and himself, all of which, with the possible exception of the last, were for moderate Republican candidates, that is they were all from privileged backgrounds and were often considered not conservative enough by their own party. This is particularly evident in the reaction of conservative evangeli
cals to George Bush as a presidential candidate, not only were objections raised against the conservative credentials of George Bush when Ronald Regan chose him as a running mate in 1980 by the leaders of the Christian Right, but he also had to devote a considerable amount of effort to reassuring this group during his own Presidential campaigns and term, as well as fend off Pat Robertson’s campaign in 1988 and Pat Buchanan’s in 1992. But the most interesting aspect of George Bush’s courting of conservative evangeli
cals during these campaigns was the very prominent role played by his son in this process.

By the time of George Bush’s 1988 Presidential campaign, the significance of the evangelical vote to Republican candidates was widely recognised as crucial in winning elections. In order to gain these votes, George Bush’s campaign staff organised for him to meet with Religious Right leaders, appear on Christian television shows, visit evangelical universities,
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churches and conferences, recruited a prominent evangelical to the campaign team, Doug Wead, and used the slogan “compassionate conservative” to attempt to appeal simultaneously to both conservative evangelicals and moderates. But most importantly for this study, Bush became his father’s unofficial ambassador to and advisor on the Christian Right, organising meetings and appearances with evangelical leaders, consulting with prominent evangelicals himself and arranging for the production of media profiles and campaign literature targeted at this group. At this time, Bush met with Paul Weyrich, Jerry Falwell, Jim Dobson, Pat Robertson and James Robison and in George Bush: Man of Integrity, a campaign profile produced by Doug Wead, spoke about his close relationship with Billy Graham. In addition to this, the George Bush campaign’s only advisor on evangelical matters, the afore mentioned Doug Wead who had been an Assemblies of God minister, reported directly to Bush and remains his personal advisor on the Christian Right to the present day.

Bush reprised this role for his father’s re-election campaign in 1992, again being used as an unofficial advisor on evangelical matters and an unofficial conduit to the Religious Right.

What this indicates is that Bush experienced first hand the difficulties involved in catering to the political desires of conservative evangelicals and exactly what those desires were. Furthermore, the experience allowed him to personally network with the major players of the political side of evangelical Christianity and this would have been an invaluable experience for someone intending to embark on a political career of their own. But most importantly, Bush’s work on his father’s first presidential campaign began not long after he re-engaged with Christianity, making him an evangelical Christian able to talk to other evangelicals on the same level and lay the ground work for establishing his own credentials within the evangelical community.

However, Bush’s dealings with the Christian Right for his father’s 1988 and 1992 Presidential campaigns were not his first exposure to this demographic. When he opened his own political career with an unsuccessful run for the Nineteenth District Texan Federal Congressional seat in 1978, Bush ran into the same problems that had and would continue to plague his father’s dealings with the Right wing of the Republican Party, he was seen as a wealthy moderate out of touch with the electorate. In addition, he ran asfoul of conservative Christians in particular due to
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the serving of alcohol at a function aimed at university students.\textsuperscript{55} However, apart from this there is only one other aspect of interest regarding this campaign for this study, Bush’s political statements during the campaign. As was developed at the end of Chapter One, for our purposes here it is only necessary to examine his opinions on welfare, religious liberty, social issues and foreign policy. Since efforts to locate Bush’s views on foreign policy at this time have been unsuccessful and his statements on welfare were limited to desiring a review of the list of recipients and cutting payments to those he felt were cheating the system, it is necessary to focus on religious liberty and social issues.\textsuperscript{56} Bush’s opinions on religious liberty were also limited as, as far as education was concerned, he was in favour of offering more choices to parents but how this translated into policy was something he did not really discuss.\textsuperscript{57} On social issues, Bush was hardly more verbose, he said that he opposed the Equal Rights Amendment as it was, in his opinion, unnecessary and was personally against abortion but would not push for a constitutional amendment on the issue.\textsuperscript{58} If nothing else, this demonstrates the difficulties of determining an individual’s complete political position from a single and relatively unimportant campaign conducted over twenty-five years ago. However, it should be kept in mind that this campaign occurred several years before Bush’s born-again experience and is really only useful in highlighting two points, his political position prior to becoming an evangelical and the political power of conservative evangelical Christians. At the very least, this examination demonstrates that Bush held similar positions to that of the emerging Christian Right, but, on social issues in particular, could be considered not conservative enough, as his opinion on abortion demonstrates. In addition, as the alcohol incident indicates, conservative Christians were an important demographic and this encounter also raises suspicions that perhaps Bush’s evangelicalism may have even been politically motivated, that is he became an evangelical because it would further his political career and give him greater appeal to a valuable electoral demographic of the Republican Party.\textsuperscript{59} While this is possible, it would be extremely difficult to prove and, while the issue should be raised, perhaps one should take the advice of Bush himself and remember that it is not the place of Governors of Texas or religious studies scholars for that matter to rule on issues of the heart. However, it is now time to examine Bush’s record as Governor of Texas.

Moving on to his actions and statements campaigning for and as Governor of Texas, it is immediately apparent that Bush learnt a great deal about successful campaigning from his father and his advisors. His campaign strategies focused on a limited number of issues, which again may
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make it difficult to obtain a fully rounded appreciation of Bush’s political position, and this is a scheme that he would repeat when running for the Presidency. In addition to this, service in the Texas state legislature is very much a part time affair, it meets for only one hundred and forty days every two years and due to indiscretions during the Reconstruction period, the Texan constitution was amended to invest very little executive power in the Governor. This means that not only does the Texas legislature by its very nature focus only on a small number of the most pressing issues at any one session, but also that Bush often just proposed the ideas and left working out the details to others. Both of these factors will constrain this paper’s ability to exhaustively examine Bush’s statements and policies at this stage in his career, and for the most part, autobiographies and biographies have been relied upon, with their obvious biases accounted for by attempting to balance the various opinions concerning Bush’s time as Governor of Texas. What is very clear though is that Bush recognised that it was important to cater to conservative evangelicals, conducting visits to evangelical churches and universities and describing himself as a ‘compassionate conservative’, again to appeal simultaneously to moderates and the Christian Right without antagonising the two vastly different groups. This is supported by a Christian Coalition Voter Guide from his 1994 campaign that describes Bush as their favoured candidate for governor due to his positions on education vouchers, abortion, deregulation of education and gay rights. In addition to this, his campaign promises and legislative proposals will further demonstrate how he made himself an attractive candidate to the Religious Right, again using the areas identified as major concerns of conservative evangelicals in Chapter One, although it should be noted that foreign policy will not be examined due to Bush’s office being a state position at this time.

Beginning with welfare, welfare reform was one of the major focuses of Bush’s campaigns for and terms as Governor of Texas. This reform did not just concentrate on the existing welfare system in Texas but also involved the development of what Bush called faith-based programs. In
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general terms, Bush proposed that charitable organizations, mainly religious ones, in conjunction with the support of the government, see to the social welfare needs of the less fortunate.67 Bush’s plan consisted of several measures to encourage suitable organizations in this area, increasing state assistance and funds, changing existing restrictions on how this aid could be distributed and to whom, providing liability insurance for medical professionals who volunteered their time and providing alternative licensing arrangements for specifically religious organizations so that they could receive accreditation even though their programs were based on religious methods.68 In promoting the program, Bush said

_In every instance where my administration sees a responsibility to help people, we will look first to the faith-based organisations, to charities and community groups that have shown their ability to save and change lives._69

Some of the religious programs that Bush specifically supported included organizations that promote abstinence, Second Chance which operates group homes for unwed teenage mothers and Teen Challenge which administers religiously based alcohol and drug rehabilitation programs.70 In relation to Teen Challenge in particular, Bush stated

_I support faith based programs … I believe that a conversion to religion by its very nature promotes sobriety._71

But Bush’s support was not just limited to youth services, he also supported Charles Colston’s Prison Fellowship which manages prisons and more exclusively welfare focused groups such as Lutheran Social Services of the South which provides mentoring for people moving off welfare and into employment, United Community Centres which also offers counselling services for welfare recipients and the Christian Women’s Job Corps which assists women in securing jobs.72 What is important to note about these specific programs is that many of them are explicitly evangelical in nature. There is no doubt that under this scheme religious charities received substantial government funding and support, but this policy also explicitly addressed conservative evangelical beliefs that the less fortunate are the responsibility of the religious and not the government. However, this is by no means all, Bush not only described these policies as “protecting Texans’ right to free exercise of religion without government encroachment” but also implied that poverty was due to a lack of faith and that this justified his vision of the role of religious charities in combating it.73 If Bush sees aid to religious organizations as protecting religious liberty and a person’s social ills as due to their
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religious situation, then it will be interesting to examine first his specific protections of religious liberty and second his opinions on other more contentious social issues.

For conservative evangelicals, freedom to practice one’s religion often centres on education policy, in particular the protection of religious schools, control over what is taught in public schools and the role of religion in public schools. Another of Bush’s major concerns while Governor of Texas was education and it is interesting to note how the concerns of the Christian Right received attention in this policy area. In his first term education reform package, Bush was primarily concerned with returning control of public schools to the local community. Although not an explicitly religious measure, Bush claimed that this would make easier for parents that were uneasy with school management and curriculum to engineer change in their local public schools. Bush said

*I’m going to deregulate the schools districts so that local parents and teachers and administrators can develop programs that best fit their kids.*

What is important about such a measure is that it enabled individuals, including evangelicals, to determine what is and what is not taught in their public schools simply by getting themselves elected to their local school board. Thus those with minority views, such as evangelicals, would find it easier to engineer change at the local level than with a centralised state education agency. With regard to what he thought should be taught in public schools, Bush opened his second term with a speech stressing the need to teach children about values,

*Some people think it’s inappropriate to make moral judgements anymore. Not me. Because for our children to have the kind of life we want for them, they must learn to say yes to responsibility, yes to family, yes to honesty and work … and no to drugs, no to violence, no to promiscuity or having babies out of wedlock.*

Although this call for general moral values is more concerned with social issues than religious liberty, by calling for such things to be taught to all children, that is in public schools, it can be seen that Bush is trying to raise the profile of religion in state schools. On the issue of school prayer in particular, Bush said that he supported voluntary prayer in public schools and was in favour of a constitutional amendment on the issue but that he felt silent prayer was preferable. When asked his opinion on school prayer, Bush told reporters “Why do I think that prayer is important? … I believe that there is an almighty loving God, and I think that if students choose to do so, it’s an important principle.” So with respect to public education, Bush made several efforts to reintroduce
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religious values into public schools, deregulating control over what is taught to local authorities, pushing for the teaching of general moral values and supporting voluntary school prayer.

Regarding religious education, Bush supported ultimately unsuccessful measures to introduce a voucher system to assist the parents of children in public schools to transfer their children to private schools. 80 Again though not explicitly religious in orientation, this proposal would have provided state assistance to parents that wished to send their children to private religious schools, thus supporting conservative evangelical desires for such measures. 81 As to more specific protections of religious liberty, Bush was a vocal supporter of the Texan Religious Freedom Restoration Act, legislation that prevented the government from encroaching on the individual’s right to the free exercise of religion except when the state had a compelling interest and chose the least restrictive method of enforcement. 82 Bush said that

*The Texas Religious Freedom Restoration Act says loud and clear: Texas will not stand for government interference with the free exercise of religion.* 83

If this alone is not seen as protecting religious liberty, it is also interesting to note that this piece of legislation was virtually identical to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed at the national level, which was vigorously supported by conservative evangelicals. 84 Bush not only supported measures to increase the profile of religion in public schools but also attempted to protect religious liberty through his pursuit of a voucher program for private education and his support for the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

Finally, in the area of social issues or “family values”, Bush had a great deal to say and propose in this area while Governor of Texas. In general terms, Bush called for spiritual renewal of society and condemned what he saw as a lack of moral values, saying “I am convinced that to fundamentally and permanently change our culture, we need spiritual renewal in America”, virtually echoing sentiments by Christian Right leaders regarding social issues. 85 Concerning homosexuality, Bush demonstrated his sympathy with conservative evangelical opinions in this area in his views on three pieces of legislation. 86 The first concerned a planned repeal of Texas’ anti-sodomy statute which Bush opposed, stating that his stand represented “a symbolic gesture of traditional values.” 87 Alternatively, he supported a bill which would restrict the adoption of children by gay couples, saying that “what’s best for children is a married man or a married woman as their
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parents.” Finally, he fought against measures to include sexual orientation in a revision of Texas’ hate crimes legislation, saying that “all crime is hate crime” and that “it’s hard to distinguish between one degree of hate and another.” He also said that in his opinion,

*I think the way to get rid of hate in people’s hearts, the best course I know is religion. The truth of the matter is hate and evil exist, and something much larger than government will help heal the hearts of man.*

However, at the same time, he lectured Republicans on the need to treat homosexuals with respect while opposing gay marriage. On the issue of abortion, Bush pushed for legislation requiring parental notification prior to underage teenagers undergoing this procedure that was ultimately passed by the legislature. Concerning this he said “I believe that life is valuable, even when it is unwanted, even when it is physically imperfect.” Personally he described himself as pro-life but respectful of the law that allowed women a choice, feeling that there was no point pursuing legal avenues to prevent abortions if community attitudes were not in agreement. Bush felt that it was more realistic to make incremental changes like those above, although he said that he did support a constitutional amendment. When explaining his personal views on the subject, Bush stated

*I have a reverence for life; my faith teaches that life is a gift from our Creator. In a perfect world, life is given by God and only taken by God. I hope someday that our society will respect life, the full spectrum of life, from the unborn to the elderly. I hope someday unborn children will be protected by law and welcomed in life.*

What is interesting about how Bush expressed his opposition to abortion is that he emphasised the role of his religious beliefs in his opinion and this is the only social issue that Bush spoke of in this way while Governor. In the area of contraception, Bush promoted programs advocating abstinence rather than other methods of contraception and the adoption of unwanted children. In a speech for organisations that promote abstinence, Bush said

*Across America, under a program called True Love Waits, nearly a million teens have pledged themselves to abstain from sex until marriage. Our teenagers feel the pressures of complex times, but also the upward pull of a better nature.*

Although Bush did not demonstrate opinions on the full spectrum of social issues of interest to conservative evangelicals, the positions he did articulate are highly consistent with those identified with the Christian Right, basically he described himself as against abortion and gay rights but stressed the importance of abstinence from sexual relations until marriage. Furthermore, Bush’s
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constant emphasis on moral values clearly demonstrates his agreement with Religious Right opinions in the area of social issues.

In examining Bush’s religious and early political life, this chapter concentrated on three main issues, successfully identifying Bush as an evangelical Christian, examining, albeit briefly, his political history and a more detailed discussion of his record as Governor of Texas in three specific areas, welfare, religious liberty and social issues. In the first case, by focusing on five key points, denomination, belief, public expression of religious issues, agreement with prominent evangelical figures and the goals of major evangelical organisations, it was demonstrated that, although not immediately apparent, Bush is in fact an evangelical Christian. It is admitted that some discrepancies were noted, in particular Bush has never explicitly stated his view of the role of the Bible in his religious life or his belief in the eschatological ideas common but not universal to evangelicalism, however, on the whole, Bush’s religious life is highly compatible with the broad definition of evangelical Christianity used in this paper. Interestingly, an examination of his political experience indicated that he had exposure to the Christian Right long before his born again experience and was able to cultivate extensive contacts within the movement shortly after his renewal of faith. However, Bush’s general political stance early in his career seems to indicate that he was not particularly concerned with either promoting or even satisfying the desires of conservative evangelicals. Finally, Bush’s statements and policy decisions with respect to his faith based programs, education reforms and religious liberty and social issues such as homosexuality, abortion and contraception demonstrate that he has a great deal of sympathy for the Christian Right political agenda. When compared to his earlier congressional political concerns, Bush’s gubernatorial agenda is highly compatible with that of conservative evangelicals, in particular his stance on abortion has moved from one where he was not prepared to seek changes in the law that would reflect his personal pro-life stance to one where he said he did support a constitutional amendment against abortion. Still, due to a limited articulation of his political agenda, there were many issues of interest to the Christian Right that Bush did not address while governor and it will be interesting to examine his actions as president to obtain a more rounded appreciation of his political philosophy. However, as to whether Bush has continued to espouse or even expand this political agenda while president is an issue that will be discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 3

This chapter is concerned with examining Bush’s political agenda while President with respect to four specific areas identified as the major policy concerns of conservative evangelicals in Chapter One. These policy areas are welfare and faith-based programs, education and religious liberty, social issues and foreign policy and they will be examined here in this order. It should be noted that the focus will not just be upon Bush’s actions as President but also on statements and promises that he made throughout the campaign. However, several points should be noted before this analysis continues, concerning the nature of Bush’s presidential campaign and the sources used for this chapter. As with Bush’s gubernatorial career examined in the last chapter, he continued to run a highly disciplined campaign at the federal level, but any deficiencies in fully appreciating Bush political situation should be balanced by a higher profile and greater variety of issues that he encountered during his first term as president. Also, while many sources used in the last chapter will again be used here, namely autobiographies and biographies, these will be supplemented with two other types of material, other primary sources in the form of speeches and newspaper articles and the beginnings of detailed secondary source studies. However, the use of this material is subject to the limitations noted in the Introduction, namely their overwhelming nature in the case of primary sources and their obvious biases in the case of secondary sources.

Beginning with the policy area of welfare, Bush’s proposals in this area at the federal level were, for the most part, simply a more ambitious version of the welfare and faith-based legislation that was enacted in Texas while he was governor. It is also important to note that once again, welfare was one of the centre-pieces of Bush’s campaign proposals and consequently one of the major focuses of his first term. During the campaign, Bush not only made his opposition to the existing welfare system very apparent, but promised to enact policies that would encourage charities, especially religious ones, to help the needy in conjunction with government. Bush


proposed to relax state restrictions on religious groups that sought to use federal funds to help the
disadvantaged. In particular, he felt that such organisations should have alternative licensing
requirements that do not compromise their religious nature and that care should be taken to ensure
that secular alternatives were available for people who did not voluntarily wish to participate in
religiously based programs. At its most basic, this was simply a promise to expand already existing
charitable choice laws that had been passed in 1996. He also pledged to make it easier for people to
claim donations to charity tax deductible, even if they did not itemise them, and that money given to
charity would be returned to the giver in the form of tax credits. By promoting religious solutions
to social welfare problems, these promises are clearly compatible with the views of the conservative
evangelicals in the area of welfare, that is their opinion that the disadvantaged are the responsibility
of religious organisations and the community rather than government.

When it came to enacting these promises as legislation, Bush encountered several
difficulties and was ultimately unsuccessful in achieving all of his aims. His first step was to issue
an executive order to create a new office within the White House to coordinate efforts to encourage
faith-based programs, the Office of Faith-Based and Community Issues. Its original aim was to
secure passage of legislation designed to relax existing restrictions on the distribution of state funds
to religious organisations however, as this legislation was passed by the House, heavily amended in
the Senate and ultimately ignored after the September 11 attacks and the administration’s
refocusing on foreign policy goals, it eventually expanded its interest to much broader aims. Its
new brief became one of educating organisations on the federal assistance available to them,
promoting tax deductions for donations to charity and encouraging other government agencies to
become more faith-based friendly in their distribution of state funds to charitable groups.
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same executive order, agencies within five existing departments were also created to further these goals and a later third executive order concerning faith-based issues created another two departmental offices in addition to the original five.\textsuperscript{10} On his first executive order, Bush stated

\textit{When we see social needs in America, my administration will look first to faith based programs and community groups.}\textsuperscript{11}

Interestingly, the first director of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Issues, John Dilulio, was a Democrat and had several revealing comments to make about the purpose of Bush’s faith-based initiatives after he resigned from the position in August of 2001.\textsuperscript{12} He claimed that the primary concern in implementing Bush’s faith-based policies was to appease the Christian Right and the perceived preferential treatment that evangelical groups received from Bush’s administration in this area can be seen as confirmation of this.\textsuperscript{13} After the defeat of his faith-based legislation, Bush bypassed Congress and signed a second executive order on faith-based issues which made religious organisations eligible for federal funding, hence the broader goals of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Issues.\textsuperscript{14} On this second executive order, Bush said

\textit{no funds will be used to directly support inherently religious activities ... [and] no organisation that qualifies for funds will ever be forced to change its identity.}\textsuperscript{15}

Through this executive order, Bush managed to achieve his aim of relaxing state restrictions on the distribution of funds to religious organisations but due to his failure to enact the necessary legislation in Congress, he was forced to rely on executive orders, with all of their problems, to achieve his goal. However, Bush was successful in passing one, limited, measure to encourage taxpayers to donate to charity, but it was by no means anywhere near the measures he had proposed during his campaign that would not require itemisation of these deductions and would have resulted in tax credits for the giver.\textsuperscript{16} Most of the difficulties Bush faced in implementing his welfare agenda stemmed from criticisms that his legislative proposals would weaken the traditionally strong separation between church and state in America.\textsuperscript{17} His measures allowing faith-based organisations to practice preferential hiring based on an applicant’s religious beliefs and grant them exemptions
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from equal opportunity employment laws proved particularly problematic. Consequently, Bush was often forced to defend his proposals by making a distinction between what the Constitution forbids, the state funding the proliferation of religious beliefs, and what he saw the Constitution as permitting, the state assisting religious organisations that attempted to tend to the needs of the less fortunate. On this issue, Bush concisely articulated what he saw as underlying this difference.

*I believe that our government should support works of charity that are motivated by faith - but our government should never fund the teaching of faith itself.*

But this was by no means all of Bush’s ideological notions concerning faith-based programs, when he signed his second faith-based executive order, Bush made the following comment:

*The days of discrimination against religious groups just because they are religious are coming to an end.*

This idea that religious organisations had been denied government funds in the past due to their religious nature was a recurring theme when Bush spoke about his faith-based programs and he consistently promised to rectify this imbalance even after elected. Thus Bush’s position is that faith-based programs are not just about helping the disadvantaged more effectively, they are also about religious liberty and properly understanding what he sees as the separation between church and state in America. Although almost all of his faith-based welfare proposals have at this stage not been successfully enacted as law, they are still representative of conservative evangelical opinions that the less fortunate are not the responsibility of government but are instead the purview of religious agencies. Thus by attempting to promote faith-based programs as the answer to the social welfare problems of America, Bush has demonstrated a welfare agenda strongly influenced by the Christian Right.

As with welfare, education was another major policy area that Bush campaigned on at both the gubernatorial and presidential level and once again, his proposals similar but more sophisticated versions of what he had attempted to achieve while governor. His campaign promises in this area focused on increasing federal spending on education, greater accountability for how such funds are spent by schools and more choices for parents when public schools fail to provide the level of service they desire. Concerning the last of these, Bush promised to establish a voucher system
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where parents could use the funds that the federal government would have provided to their child’s public school to pay for alternative educational arrangements such as a private school, another public school, a charter school or tutoring for their child.\textsuperscript{25} Due to its promotion of religious liberty in the realm of education, this proposal clearly demonstrates a focus on the concerns of the conservative evangelicals in the area of education in particular and religious liberty in general.

Bush attempted to translate these promises into legislation by passing a comprehensive education bill that originally contained several noteworthy features. He was able to achieve his desire to increase federal spending on education and make schools accountable for these funds by assessing student performance in standardised tests, however the most interesting of these features were the provisions for school choice, or providing assistance to parents who choose to send their children to private schools.\textsuperscript{26} Specifically, Bush attempted to introduce a voucher program where parents could use the state funds that would be spent on their child in the public system to meet some of the costs of private education when public schools did not meet state expectations, but one of the compromises that had to be made for the bill to pass was that the voucher system was dropped.\textsuperscript{27} However, it has been argued that Bush was not particularly concerned about this and was prepared to make the necessary sacrifice of the voucher program in order to achieve his other, more important, goals on education like standardised testing and accountability for federal funds.\textsuperscript{28} This leads one to suspect that vouchers were more a way of him demonstrating to the Christian Right that he was looking after their interests while being able to blame the failure to achieve this objective on Congress. So while Bush appeared to be pushing for a specific piece of legislation desired by the Religious Right, this attempt seemed to be more concerned with appearances and less with real conviction about the merits of education vouchers. Interestingly, members of Bush’s administration expressed a preference for Christian schools over public ones, claiming that a value consensus was much harder to achieve in an environment where there was a variety of moral foundations.\textsuperscript{29} This is noteworthy in that it is moral as well as religious concerns that lay the groundwork for the social agenda of conservative evangelicals, thus making it appear that Bush’s administration implicitly supported the foundations of the Christian Right’s social aims. Later in his term, Bush refocused on one of the major reforms he had made while Governor of Texas, that of decentralizing educational control to local school districts, by attempting to make spending decisions for federal grants the responsibility of local authorities.\textsuperscript{30} As was seen in the preceding
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chapter, this would allow parents in general to exercise much greater control over what and how their children are taught in public schools and because of this would have been of great interest to conservative evangelicals. Once again, although the one specific legislative proposal that was clearly aimed at the concerns of the Religious Right was dropped by the Bush administration in the process of negotiating legislation, other statements and more general educational measures are clearly consistent with Christian Right efforts to reform and ideas about the education system, demonstrating Bush’s agreement with their agenda in this area.

Social issues are probably the most interesting aspect of Bush’s campaign and time as President as it was here that he was the most consistent with Christian Right ideas although one often has to read between the lines to determine this. Even though there was little legislation actually proposed by Bush during his campaign, he was asked and stated his positions on a variety of issues concerning abortion, stem cell research, gay rights, drug use and general morality. Concerning the first, abortion, Bush proclaimed himself to be pro-life but came under fire from some Christian Right leaders due to his unwillingness to actively push for a Constitutional amendment banning abortion if elected. He stated that he felt that it was first necessary for attitudes in the community to change before an amendment to the law was viable. This is interesting in that it appears to be a back down on his earlier position on this issue as governor and a return to his stance when running for Congress. Although it is important that, as president, he was no longer prepared to ban abortion in a way consistent with his personal beliefs, by saying that he felt it was first necessary for community attitudes to change, Bush was perhaps attempting to simultaneously appear both moderate and conservative on a very contentious and divisive issue. Still, as will be demonstrated shortly, when president, Bush practiced the incremental changes in the law that he had felt superior to a constitutional ban while governor. Bush was also opposed to some types of stem cell research for the same reasons he opposed abortion, the destruction of foetuses during experimentation. On the issue of gay rights, Bush was actually quite coy during the campaign, maintaining that whatever laws individual states chose to enact on this issue were their own business and not the concern of the federal government. In fact, Bush did everything he could to make gay rights a non-issue, both refusing the support of and actually meeting with gay rights groups as well as saying that he would not appoint openly homosexually men to his cabinet. As with abortion then, Bush appeared to be confirming his moderate as opposed to extreme
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conservativism. However, when pushed on the issue of gay marriage, he said “I think marriage is a sacred institution between a man and a woman,” an opinion that he would repeat during his term and is revealing in its focus on the religious aspect of marriage. So when pressed, Bush demonstrated that he may hold a view of gay rights similar to conservative evangelical opinions. Interestingly, Bush used the same argument, that it is the business of individual states, when asked his opinion on state laws legalising the use of marijuana for medical purposes. As to general morality, Bush felt that people, especially youth, should be encouraged to act responsibly, avoiding having children before married, and even stated that his desire to reduce the marriage penalty in the tax code was due to his belief that a core moral value should not be discouraged by the state. So, it is concerning general morality that Bush appeared to be the closest to Christian Right opinions on social issues during his campaign. This examination of Bush’s opinions on social issues such as abortion, stem cell research, gay rights, drug use and general moral issues while campaigning for the presidency has demonstrated how a political figure can modify their message to broaden their appeal to the electorate. However, when Bush’s positions are examined in depth, hints of a more conservative social issues agenda that is very similar to that of the Religious Right begin to appear. This will be even more apparent when Bush’s opinions and actions as president are now discussed.

As president, it was again Bush’s opinions that outweighed his actions on social issues, although occasionally his views did result in him personally changing the law and expressing certain legislative desires in these areas. Concerning abortion, it is notable that on his third day in office, Bush reinstated the Mexico City Policy, originally formulated by Ronald Reagan, which had cut aid to international family planning organisations that provided information about abortion. He also pushed for legislation banning partial birth abortions, legislation that successfully passed Congress. When signing the bill into law, he said

\[
\text{[the right to life] cannot be granted or denied by government because it does not come from government, it comes from the Creator of life.}
\]

Bush also proposed other legislation to protect the rights of the unborn, for example he introduced a foetal protection bill which would have made it a federal offence to harm an unborn child while committing a violent crime against its mother, but this was defeated in the Senate. In this way, it can be seen that while not pursuing a total ban on abortion, Bush attempted to and in some ways
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was successful in seeking minor changes in the law that protected the rights of the unborn. But what is most striking is that as president, Bush was prepared to justify his pro-life position on religious grounds, demonstrating not just that in the area of abortion he follows conservative evangelical opinions but also their religious justifications.

It is on similar grounds Bush also expressed his opposition to stem cell research. In formulating federal restrictions on this issue, Bush only permitted work on existing cell lines that had already been taken from embryos, meaning that the harvesting of new cell lines from embryos was prohibited if federal funding sought. Bush said that there were two issues at stake,

First, are these frozen embryos human life, and therefore, something precious to be protected? And second, if they’re going to be destroyed anyway, shouldn’t they be used for a greater good, for research that has the potential to save and improve other lives?

He expressed his decision to ban the extraction of new cell lines in the following way:

I … believe that human life is a sacred gift from our Creator. I worry about a culture that devalues life, and believe as your president I have an important obligation to foster and encourage respect for life in America and throughout the world.

So as with abortion, Bush pushed for a minor change in the law that denied funds to research destroying embryos rather than an outright ban on such procedures and also expressed his opposition to such practices in religious terms. Once again, Bush can be seen as espousing a conservative evangelical opinion on a contentious social issue and using religious beliefs to justify his position.

Moving on to gay rights, Bush’s opinions in this area did not exactly change when he became president but they did take on a greater sense of urgency, meaning that Bush was required to articulate a position on the issue of gay marriage and stick to it. When this issue moved beyond that of the concerns of the individual states, Bush demonstrated an extremely conservative opinion on this matter, saying “marriage is between a man and a woman … [and] we ought to codify that one way or the other and we’ve got lawyers looking at the best way to do that”, a statement that was taken to mean that he supported a Constitutional amendment against gay marriage and other comments that Bush made were seen as confirmation of this opinion. Furthermore, Bush has certainly not supported measures to give the legal recognition necessary for gay couples to receive

---
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tax and health benefits on a level comparable to that which heterosexual couples enjoy. On other gay rights issues, Bush did retain Bill Clinton’s Office of National Aids Policy, but only after a public backlash over his original plan to close the office, and appointed two openly homosexual men to positions in his administration, one to head the Office of National Aids policy and the other to sit on the Advisory Commission on the Arts. He also appointed a gay man as ambassador to Romania and left intact the spousal benefits for federal homosexual employees that Bill Clinton had introduced. Still, Bush’s efforts against gay rights clearly outweigh his actions in support of this issue and while he has not explicitly expressed his opposition to homosexuality in general, Bush has consistently opposed major efforts to promote gay rights, although he has not expressed this opposition in religious terms. Regardless of this though, Bush is expressing opinions in agreement with conservative evangelicals with respect to gay rights, just not to the same extent or using the same reasons.

The issue of contraception is also interesting in that the Bush administration has consistently promoted abstinence as means of preventing the spread of sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancies, often to the detriment of the promotion of other methods of contraception. In several cases, information concerning contraceptive methods and their effectiveness in preventing disease and pregnancy was removed from government websites so that it could be reviewed in order to determine if the information provided was too sexually explicit or promoted sexual activity. This is a policy that Bush continued at the international level, attempting to modify international agreements that referred to contraception or placing restrictions on the distribution of funds to organisations that provide family planning services, requiring them to promote abstinence above other methods of contraception. Bush also made the delivery of domestic funds for sex education dependent on an organisation’s promotion of abstinence rather than other forms of contraception. In his 2004 State of the Union address, Bush said

*Abstinence for young people is the only certain way to avoid sexually-transmitted diseases.*

Once again, Bush is promoting the opinions of conservative evangelicals with respect to contraception, that abstinence is the only acceptable method. On more general social ills, Bush has also been vocal in condemning several aspects of modern life. He has also expressed and enforced his opposition to euthanasia, or the right of people to commit assisted suicide, by banning the use of federally restricted substances for this purpose.
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gone to extreme lengths to combat allsorts of drug usage, especially state laws legalising the medical use of marijuana, but before the September 11 attacks, his proposed domestic initiatives for late 2001 concerned dealing with a variety of social issues including offensive music and deteriorating familial relationships.\footnote{G. W. Bush, ‘President Discusses War on Terrorism, November 8 2001’, available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/print/20011108-13.html, accessed November 30 2004, p. 3; Bush, ‘State of the Union Address, January 20 2004’, loc. cit., p. 9; Frum, op. cit., p. 111; Singer, op. cit., p. 85.} In this way, Bush can be seen as espousing positions in agreement with Christian Right opinions on issues such as euthanasia, drug use, censorship and general moral values. Thus Bush has consistently held stances on a variety of social issues that are the same as those of conservative evangelicals and on occasion, he has even used the same religiously based arguments presented by the Religious Right to justify their positions.

The final area of concern here is foreign policy and Bush’s opinions and actions in this area studied here will focus on just four specific areas, general issues concerning foreign policy, Bush’s stance towards Israel, September 11 and Afghanistan and the war in Iraq, and on one specific issue, namely the compatibility of Bush’s foreign policy opinions with the eschatological views of conservative evangelicalism. This means that only very particular aspects of these fairly general areas will be discussed.

During his first presidential campaign, Bush was not particularly concerned with detailing his foreign policy plans for two main reasons, his unfamiliarity with the area and the focus of his campaign on domestic issues.\footnote{Burke, loc. cit., p. 32; Bush, ‘2000 Victory Speech’, loc. cit., p. 3; Bush, A Charge to Keep, op. cit., pp. 55, 235, 239-40; Bush, ‘President George W. Bush’s Inaugural Address’, loc. cit., p. 2; Daalder and Lindsay, America Unbound, op. cit., pp. 53-4, 63, 71-2; Daalder and Lindsay, “Bush’s Foreign Policy Revolution”, loc. cit., pp. 111, 114; Fortier and Ornstein, loc. cit., p. 146; Frum, op. cit., p. 100; Greenstein, “The Leadership Style of George W. Bush”, loc. cit., p. 7; PfiFFNER, loc. cit., p. 3; Singer, op. cit., p. 145; Suskind, op. cit., p. 82.} However, what he did articulate suggested that his approach to foreign policy would be realistic and focus on protecting and promoting the interests of America rather than using American troops for peace-keeping activities or nation-building.\footnote{A. Busch, “On the Edge: The Electoral Career of George W. Bush” in G. Gregg and M. Rozell (eds), Considering the Bush Presidency, New York, 2004, p. 181; Bush, A Charge to Keep, op. cit., p. 240; Daalder and Lindsay, America Unbound, op. cit., pp. 55, 235, 239-40; Bush, ‘President George W. Bush’s Inaugural Address’, loc. cit., p. 2; Daalder and Lindsay, America Unbound, op. cit., pp. 53-4, 63, 71-2; Daalder and Lindsay, “Bush’s Foreign Policy Revolution”, loc. cit., pp. 111, 114; Fortier and Ornstein, loc. cit., p. 146; Frum, op. cit., p. 100; Greenstein, “The Leadership Style of George W. Bush”, loc. cit., p. 7; PfiFFNER, loc. cit., p. 3; Singer, op. cit., p. 145; Suskind, op. cit., p. 82.} In its basic form, Bush’s opinions on foreign policy were in agreement with the somewhat vague ideals of conservative evangelicals. He supported increases to defence budgets, when it suited his political interests, and overhauls of the American military that would result in enhancing America’s ability to defend itself and this was subsequently turned in the administration’s defence modernization policy.\footnote{Bush, A Charge to Keep, op. cit., pp. 55, 239-40; Daalder and Lindsay, America Unbound, op. cit., pp. 36-9, 41-5, 48-9, 112; Daalder and Lindsay, “Bush’s Foreign Policy Revolution”, loc. cit., pp. 105-9; Greenstein, “The Leadership Style of George W. Bush”, loc. cit., p. 6; HeCLO, loc. cit., p. 47; Singer, op. cit., pp. 138-9, 200, 222; B. Woodward, Bush at War, Large Print Edition, New York, 2002, pp. 334, 410.} A specific example of this was Bush’s campaign pledge and his administration’s subsequent work on missile defence.\footnote{Bush, A Charge to Keep, op. cit., pp. 55, 239-40; Daalder and Lindsay, America Unbound, op. cit., pp. 36-9, 41-5, 48-9, 112; Daalder and Lindsay, “Bush’s Foreign Policy Revolution”, loc. cit., pp. 105-9; Greenstein, “The Leadership Style of George W. Bush”, loc. cit., p. 6; HeCLO, loc. cit., p. 47; Singer, op. cit., pp. 138-9, 200, 222; B. Woodward, Bush at War, Large Print Edition, New York, 2002, pp. 334, 410.} At the same time, during the campaign Bush opposed and...
when elected went to great lengths to extract America from several major international agreements including the Kyoto Protocol, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the International Criminal Court and the Biological Weapons Convention.\(^{62}\) In this way, Bush demonstrated his affinity with Christian Right beliefs that America needs a strong military and should not participate in international agencies that are contrary to America’s interests.

As president however, Bush has been forced to develop a much more detailed approach to foreign policy, primarily due to events beyond his control. Beginning with Israel, Bush attempted to be even-handed in his ground rules for American participation in a peace settlement between the Israelis and the Palestinians, but often ended up demonstrating a preference for the Israeli position. It even appears that at times, Bush’s administration had no clear direction on how to even approach the conflict.\(^{63}\) Still, Bush unequivocally indicated his support for Israel, saying

> *At my first meeting of my National Security Council, I told them that a top foreign policy priority of my administration is the safety and security of Israel. My administration will be steadfast in supporting Israel against terrorism and violence, and in seeking the peace for which all Israelis pray.*\(^{64}\)

Having said this, at the meeting in question, Bush indicated that he would be pulling out of the situation even though he favoured the Israeli position.\(^{65}\) Interestingly, when Bush did later become embroiled in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the major features of Bush’s road map for peace in the Middle East included the establishment of a Palestinian state, a Palestinian denouncement of and crackdown on terrorism, an Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and he met with the then Palestinian Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas at the White House.\(^{66}\) But at the same time, he supported Israeli security crackdowns against terrorists, later backed away from the need for an Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and refused to deal with the Palestinians while
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Yasser Arafat was in charge due to Arafat’s unwillingness to denounce terror tactics and their practitioners. So, even though Bush attempted to treat both participants equally, he actually consistently supported Israel’s interests in a manner reminiscent of the Christian Right. Still, Bush was prepared to support statehood for Palestine, demonstrating that he was prepared to move away from the conservative evangelical position on the Middle East peace process.

Moving on to September 11 and Afghanistan, what is perhaps most striking about Bush’s approach to these crises was his use of religiously influenced rhetoric to both condemn the attacks and defend his own actions. Although it is not possible to go into a detailed examination here, some pertinent features of this rhetoric can be noted. Bush went to great efforts to label America’s enemies as evil, also using other religiously-charged descriptors, and stressed religious approaches to coping with events, such as prayer and religious services. Some of his more striking comments included calling the September 11 attacks and America’s response as “a monumental struggle of good versus evil” and terming it a “crusade”. Even more revealing of how Bush constructed the crisis publicly was the following statement:

The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them. He also used Biblical quotations and references such as Exodus 23:7, II Chronicles 15:5, Job 8:13, Psalms 23:4, Isaiah 2:10-1, 57:21 and 59:6-18, Jeremiah 6:14, 8:11, 8:15 and 14:19, Ezekiel 13:10 and 13:16, Matthew 2:13-8 and 5:4, John 1:5, Romans 12:21 and Revelations 6:15-7 when speaking to the American public. These references were particularly evident in speeches like his Address to the Nation informing the American public of the commencement of hostilities against Afghanistan when he said

Initially, the terrorists may burrow deeper into caves and other entrenched hiding places ... If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocents, they have become outlaws and murderers, themselves. And they will take that lonely path at their own peril ... there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror.

Furthermore, in private, Bush even went as far as to speak of the tragedy in similar terms to Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, saying that it was “a major wakeup call for America” and “part of a spiritual awakening in America”. It could be argued that just by using this sort of language and Biblical references that Bush is showing his acceptance of evangelical eschatological ideas, however a more detailed analysis of Bush’s statements concerning September 11 and Afghanistan in relation to a study of how conservative evangelicals speak of the End Times than is possible here is probably required before this conclusion is warranted. What is also interesting about Bush’s response to September 11 is that his administration quickly moved to secure support from international agencies such as the United Nations and NATO for its war on terror. Still, when Bush moved against Afghanistan, he chose not to make much use of the military assistance offered by the international community at first, later changing his mind due to fears that the war might not be successfully completed. In this case, Bush was inconsistent with the policy of the Christian Right with regard to the need for America to be involved in international agencies, but he did paint
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the war on terror in, at the very least, quasi-religious tones that would have been very familiar to conservative evangelicals who follow evangelical eschatological ideas.

The issue of war with Iraq was also interesting for several reasons, again with the most prominent of these being how Bush framed his public announcements during this time. As before, only some general features of this rhetoric will be examined here due to length constraints, one could write an entire thesis on the religious themes in Bush’s public statements and such an exhaustive study is beyond the scope of this work. Beginning with his announcement of America’s change in policy to allow pre-emptive strikes against its enemies, Bush stated that he believes in absolute standards of morality, an opinion that is very much in agreement with people who hold literal and inerrant views of the Bible, such as conservative evangelicals.\(^{77}\) As with September 11 and Afghanistan, Bush used many of the same rhetorical techniques when speaking about Iraq, calling Saddam Hussein and his regime evil and again often speaking of religious responses to the Iraqi situation, such as prayer.\(^{78}\) While there have been several theories as to why Bush was in such a rush to declare war with Iraq, all but one of them is of no particular interest to the current discussion. The only remarkable one for our purposes here involves a theory that Bush had already decided to attack Iraq before being elected President, a not unreasonable assumption given that from the very first meeting of his National Security Council, Bush was looking at military options to deal with the Iraqi situation.\(^{79}\) The reason why it is of note is because it is claimed that Bush had religious motives for the war, basically that Iraq can be linked with Babylon and that Bush conducted a war based on the contents of the Book of Revelations in order to hasten the Second Coming of Jesus.\(^{80}\) However, it should be noted that in the context that these claims are made, no
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real evidence is given to support this theory.\textsuperscript{81} The only other issue of note with respect to Iraq that is relevant here is the Bush administration’s reluctance to involve international agencies such as the United Nations in the affair. This was evident from the very beginning with Bush and his advisors arguing over whether a new resolution from the United Nations Security Council was necessary or even desirable before America attacked Iraq.\textsuperscript{82} It was further confirmed by Bush’s willingness to attack and subsequent invasion of Iraq with little support from America’s allies.\textsuperscript{83} However, after the American occupation of Iraq was a fait accompli, Bush was prepared to accept and even encouraged United Nations involvement in Iraq.\textsuperscript{84} So, as with September 11 and Afghanistan, Bush used religiously-charged language to describe his enemies that would have been familiar to evangelicals involved with evangelical eschatology, however in the case of Iraq, Bush was much more hostile to the international community than he had been when dealing the September 11 attacks and Afghanistan, an action supported by conservative evangelicals but was still prepared to engage with the United Nations when necessary.

In general then, Bush’s approach to foreign policy has not been highly consistent with the opinions of conservative evangelicals. While he has supported measures to increase America’s ability to defend itself militarily, he did initially resist efforts to increase defence budgets. Bush has certainly demonstrated his opposition to a great number of international agencies and agreements but also has, when necessary, used these agencies and agreements to his advantage. In addition, while Bush attempted to appear to be neutral with respect to the parties involved in the Middle East peace process, he consistently expressed his support for Israel and its actions but was prepared to push for a Palestinian state. Finally, while it was not possible to demonstrate that Bush’s foreign policy decisions were influenced exclusively by any belief in evangelical eschatology, he did not hesitate to use language familiar to those who do subscribe to these beliefs when speaking of America’s enemies. So, on the whole, Bush appeared to act more in a way suggesting that he was sympathetic to Christian Right opinions regarding foreign policy than not, but unlike the other policy areas examined above, Bush was by no means as consistent in his actions.

\textsuperscript{81} It is worth noting however, that many eschatologically inclined evangelicals spoke of the first Iraqi war in Biblical terms, see S. Harding, “Imagining the Last Days: The Politics of Apocalyptic Language” in M. Marty and R. Appleby (eds), Accounting for Fundamentalisms, The Fundamentalism Project, Vol. 4, Chicago, 1994, pp. 72-3.
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Finally, and as a caution on attempting to draw conclusions about influences on an individual’s political decisions without considering other factors, there has been a great deal of speculation as to how many of Bush’s decisions concerning foreign policy were influenced by the ideological positions of his advisors and to what extent. Again it is only possible to discuss this issue briefly here, but it is worth noting some of the comments that have been made concerning this matter. For example, some commentators note that several of Bush’s advisors, most notably Richard Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Armitage, Richard Perle and Lewis Libby, have past links with conservative thinkers and supported their efforts to more aggressively use the American military overseas, especially against Iraq, several years before Bush became president. Furthermore, a subset of this group, including Rumsfeld, Perle and Wolfowitz, were some of the major proponents of war with Iraq long before the September 11 attacks occurred. After September 11, several officials, most notably Cheney, Wolfowitz and Rumsfeld, advocated attacking Iraq as part of the response to the terrorist incident even though it was quickly determined that Iraq was not involved. Clearly then, in at least the area of Iraq, Bush was surrounded by people who could have influenced him to act independently of his religious reasons. While speaking of Bush’s advisors, it is also worth mentioning that many of them are highly religious people, with several having evangelical affiliations. For example, Condoleezza Rice and Karen Hughes are committed Presbyterians, Michael Gerson, Bush’s primary speech writer, is described as an evangelical and John Ashcroft, the former Attorney General, is a member of the Assemblies of God. Thus Bush’s use of religiously influenced rhetoric may again have been just as much a product of the influence of his advisors rather than his faith. Although this discussion of other possible influences on Bush’s political philosophy has been restricted to just some aspects of the Bush administration’s foreign policy, it is still evident that attempts to draw vast conclusions about the reasons why Bush has acted in the way that he has must take into account that not only is Bush a political figure and therefore attempting to cater to the desires of as much of the population as he can as often as he can, but that his administration’s decisions are also influenced by several other factors, especially the positions of his advisors.
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The focus of this chapter on Bush’s candidature for and time as president has enabled this paper to perform an in depth analysis of his political philosophy in four areas of prime importance to conservative evangelicals, welfare, religious liberty, social issues and foreign policy. In the area of welfare, it was demonstrated that by attempting to pursue his plan for faith based programs to provide social services to the disadvantaged, that Bush was promoting legislation that would enshrine in law evangelical beliefs about who should take care of these people and how it should be achieved, namely by religious organisations with the support of the state and not by the state alone. Bush’s education policy, which made an effort to introduce a voucher system and deregulate education spending, demonstrated how evangelicals feel that their decision to send their children to private religious schools rather than public schools should be supported and encouraged by the state and that decisions about what schools should teach should be made at the local level. Bush’s opinions on social issues such as abortion, stem cell research, gay rights, drug use, contraception and general moral issues reflected the views of conservative evangelicals on these matters and in some cases even used the religious arguments of the Christian Right to justify his opinions. Also, a foreign policy that while not consistently supporting a strong military, the state of Israel and holding negative attitudes towards international agencies and agreements, did on the whole represent these views, is once again indicative of conservative evangelical opinions concerning foreign policy. Finally though, a brief examination of other influences on Bush’s political agenda demonstrated the folly of attempting to subscribe any politician’s actions to merely one aspect of their personal beliefs and situation by discussing the influence that Bush’s advisors could have had on his decisions in the area of foreign policy and that the religious affiliations of these people may also be the origin of Bush’s religious rhetoric on terrorism and Iraq. Therefore, there is little doubt that, while president, Bush promoted a legislative agenda that was highly sympathetic and representative of the concerns of the Christian Right. However, there are some discrepancies that must be taken into account and this will be the concern of the conclusion to this paper.
Conclusion

George W. Bush once described the Bible as a “pretty good political handbook” which should immediately raise questions about his religious affiliations for anyone familiar with evangelical Christianity in America. It is also common knowledge that Bush is a very religious person and is seen by some members of the American media community to be affiliated with the Christian Right. Thus the purpose of this thesis was to examine Bush’s religiosity to determine if he is in fact an evangelical Christian and then discuss his political agenda in the context of his religious affiliations in order to establish if Bush’s political decisions have been influenced by his faith. To achieve this, Chapter One developed a five part criteria for determining an individual’s affinity not just with evangelical Christianity in general but with the more specific style of faith practiced by conservative evangelicals. The reason why the Religious Right was focused on is because of their participation in the political process, by being involved in politics, they define what the majority of evangelicals, in particular those of the conservative variety, desire from the political process. It was for this reason in particular that the last sections of Chapter One were devoted to determining the Christian Right political agenda. Returning to definitions though, by using a broad criteria encompassing a full understanding of the role of denominational affiliation, the centrality of certain beliefs about the Bible, the importance of Jesus to salvation and witnessing this relationship, the use of certain phrases to speak about one’s faith and the significance of sympathising with the opinions of prominent individuals and organisations for evangelical Christians, one could identify a public figure that is often vague about the details of their religion as an evangelical. This is particularly important for politicians who go to great lengths to please as many voters as possible and thus often obscure certain aspects of their private life. What was discovered was that an evangelical did not have to belong to any specific evangelical denomination but was required to attend a Protestant church. They also must believe in the ineffability of the Bible, the need to personally accept Jesus as their saviour, attempt to explain this relationship to others and exhibit personal religious habits such as frequent prayer and Bible reading. Furthermore, they might subscribe to evangelical eschatological opinions, but this is not strictly necessary. When speaking about their faith, they would probably use phrases such as “born-again”, “planting a mustard seed” and “walking the walk”, as well as other terms. Finally they should support individuals and organisations such as Billy Graham, Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, James Robison, Focus on the Family, the Moral Majority and the Christian Coalition, to name just a few.

By focusing on the opinions of evangelical individuals and organisations, it was possible to identify a conservative Christian agenda that has four main areas, welfare, religious liberty, social issues and foreign policy. In the area of welfare, the Christian Right were discovered to be critical of government programs combating social welfare, preferring that this problem be dealt with by
religious agencies due to their beliefs that social ills are the result of individuals and not inherent to society. Conservative evangelical ideas about religious liberty were discovered to be particularly concerned with educational issues, especially bringing religion back into public schools and control over what these schools teach, and promoting the autonomy of religious schools and religious education as a viable alternative to the public school system. On social issues, the Christian Right holds extremely conservative opinions on very divisive matters such as abortion, stem cell research, euthanasia, homosexuality, women’s rights, media censorship and drug use. And finally, foreign policy for conservative evangelicals is ultimately tied up with both their view of salvation as involving personal conversion and their eschatological ideas about the Second Coming of Jesus. On this front they promote a strong military and an assertive foreign policy that specifically protects Israel while having a generally unfavourable opinion of international agencies and agreements.

With these ground rules established, Chapter Two was concerned with identifying Bush as an evangelical Christian and examining his early political career, a run for Congress and his time as Governor of Texas. By using the five stage definition of an evangelical, it was possible to demonstrate that Bush is definitely an evangelical Christian. He not only attended an evangelical Methodist Church while living in Texas, but exhibited many of the beliefs and practices associated with evangelicalism. While he never explicitly stated his belief in the ineffability of the Bible, how he spoke of its role in his life suggested that he uses it as a guidebook in the way that evangelical Christians do. Furthermore, Bush has often spoken about how he has personally accepted Jesus into his life, utilising many of the phrases that are used by evangelicals and it was demonstrated that he does witness his faith, if only subtly. He is also well known to pray and read the Bible, but it was not possible to demonstrate his subscription to evangelical eschatological ideas, simply because, as with his views of the role of the Bible in his religious life, he has never publicly spoken about these aspects of his faith. Finally, it was discovered that Bush has firm links with several of the individuals and organisations identified as evangelical, including Billy Graham, Pat Robertson, Focus on the Family, the Promise Keepers and Community Bible Study.

In examining Bush’s early political career, several interesting features were noted. When he ran for Congress in 1978, Bush espoused a standard moderate Republican platform that was not particularly in tune with emerging Christian Right political desires, especially on social issues. However, by the time that he ran for Governor in 1994, Bush had developed more detailed agenda that specifically dealt with conservative evangelical ideas on a variety of issues and his time as Governor allowed him to address these and other concerns. First, Bush planned and attempted an overhaul of Texas’ social welfare system that embraced the use of faith-based programs to help address the needs of the less fortunate, an idea completely in agreement with conservative evangelical ideas on social welfare. With respect to religious liberty, Bush promoted the Religious
Freedom Restoration Act and a number of educational reforms dealing with deregulating education control of curricula and concerning the introduction of tuition vouchers, again pet concerns of the Christian Right. On social issues, Bush was highly conservative, signing legislation restricting abortion, opposing gay rights, promoting abstinence as the only acceptable form of contraception and speaking in general terms about morality and the need for spiritual renewal in America. All of these ideas are compatible with those of conservative evangelicals and at no point was it discovered that Bush actively opposed Christian Right initiatives or opinions on any of these issues. Thus Chapter Two demonstrated, although briefly, that Bush’s political agenda had changed between his campaign for Congress and time as Governor, with the latter exhibiting agreement with many of the political concerns of the Religious Right.

This left Chapter Three to concentrate on Bush’s campaign for and time as President and once again used the policy areas identified as of interest to conservative evangelicals. However, what was most striking about Bush’s presidential agenda was that in many ways it was virtually identical to his initiatives while Governor of Texas. Beginning with welfare, Bush planned a more expansive effort to use faith-based programs to combat social ills and there were even claims that the purpose of this idea was to accede to conservative evangelical ideas about who is responsible for the less fortunate, namely the religious and not the state. On the religious liberty front, Bush was mainly concerned with education, once again pushing for tuition vouchers and the deregulation of spending decisions to local rather than centralised authorities. The latter was demonstrated to be of particular interest to the Christian Right as they have discovered that it is easier to promote their educational ideas at the local school board level than in legislatures. With respect to social issues, Bush had a great deal to say and propose, once again expressing his opposition to abortion, stem cell research, euthanasia and gay rights while supporting media censorship and contraceptive programs focusing on abstinence and speaking of general moral ills. All of these opinions were demonstrated to be in accordance with the ideas of the Christian Right on these issues. However, several interesting points were noted about Bush and social issues, during the campaign especially, he was often reluctant to articulate his actual position on many of these concerns, only really demonstrating conservative evangelical opinions when pushed on these matters or after he had been elected president. The second important aspect was his willingness to use the religious justifications of the Religious Right when articulating his position on social issues that concerned questions about when life starts, namely abortion and stem cell research. This may demonstrate that Bush believes that it is acceptable to use religious beliefs to determine moral questions when such things cannot be determined by science and it is considered conventional by the public to use religious arguments to determine one’s position on such issues. Finally, Bush’s ideas on foreign policy proved to be the most problematic in determining how his political agenda has been influenced by his evangelical
faith. In general terms, Bush’s focus on a strong military presence and his extraction of America from several significant international agreements appeared to be in line with Christian Right concerns about the need of America to have the means to defend itself and their distrust in international agencies. Furthermore, Bush’s use of religiously charged rhetoric when speaking about terrorism and Iraq seemed to be influenced by evangelical eschatological ideas although no evidence was found to indicate that Bush himself subscribed to this worldview. However, this is where the similarities ended, Bush was prepared to engage the international community when it served his interests, such as in Afghanistan and Iraq, and attempted, but was unsuccessful, to appear even-handed in brokering peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. These incompatibilities could be viewed simply as cases where it was politic to pursue the course of action that Bush chose or as evidence that he is not eschatologically inclined. So Bush did not wholeheartedly support Israel and oppose a Palestinian state and at times used the international agencies so distrusted by conservative evangelicals. Still on the whole, as president Bush pursued a political agenda that appeared to be highly influenced by his evangelical faith.

While there are problematic elements, there is no doubt that Bush is not only an evangelical Christian but also that his political agenda since his conversion is one that is highly in agreement with the political concerns of conservative evangelicals. Still, he has not had a great deal of success in implementing many aspects of his legislative proposals and while quite happy to express opinions on several matters, has to date, been highly reluctant to pursue radical changes to the law, preferring, as with abortion in particular, to push for incremental changes while waiting for community attitudes to change. As often as commentators compare George W. Bush the politician as closer to Ronald Reagan than his father ideologically, Bush appears to have fought more for the issues of consequence to conservative evangelicals than Reagan and he also seems to be more genuinely religious than Reagan. Yet at the same time, Bush has not much more to show for his political career on the issues of interest to the Christian Right thus far than Reagan did at the end of his. Still, Bush has another four years in which to pursue matters of interest to conservative evangelicals, presuming he does not get caught up in foreign policy issues and can form the necessary Congressional alliances.
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