



“Separation of Church and State”: What It Means for Clergy



May 16, 2021

Wendi Wigham

LIS 7040, Spring 2021

Background and Introduction

On January 8, 2021, in response to the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol, the National Council of Churches issued an “Open Letter to Vice President Pence, Members of Congress, and the Cabinet Calling for the Removal of President Trump from Office.” Bishop Elizabeth Eaton, Presiding Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), was among the nation’s religious leaders who signed the letter, and she issued a call to pastors of the ELCA to sign their names to the letter as well. Reverend Mark Astrup, pastor of Peace Lutheran Church, in Cold Spring, Minnesota, was among those who added their signatures, and he posted notice of it on his personal Facebook page. The backlash was immediate.

Before signing the letter, Pastor Mark forwarded it to Peace’s council president, so he could read it, and they could discuss it. Pastor Mark wanted the council president to be aware of his intention to sign the letter, knowing that Peace could be negatively impacted by his decision to do so. Even though he posted the notice on his *personal* Facebook page and didn’t mention Peace in the post (he stated he was signing “as a pastor of the ELCA”), there were Peace members who decided to leave the church. One household stated that they would look for a “new, non-political church family” to join.

Over the past ten years, there have occasionally been complaints from some members about Pastor Mark’s sermons being “too political,” and that he should respect the separation of church and state, which has always confounded me. He has never endorsed or opposed a candidate who was running for office, has never mentioned his political affiliation or discussed political parties during a service. He has spoken of social injustices and inequities and of current issues – in our community, our country, and the world at large – and then applied the message of the gospel. He teaches members what the Word of God calls them to do in the midst of these

issues – how to act, in love and support of neighbor. That is his job. That’s what *I* want to learn when I am in church: how to apply God's Word and guidance to what is happening in the world – as messy and unpredictable as it is – how I am called, as a Christian, to live out the message of the gospel.

The way I’ve always understood it, the intent of the separation of church and state has more to do with government not controlling the church or not determining a national religion – citizens of the United States are free to worship (or not) as they please. I’ve never understood it to mean that clergy members can’t discuss social problems or issues of the day when they are preaching. So, when this recent matter regarding the signing of the “Open Letter . . .” arose, it piqued my interest in learning more about the intention of the clauses in the First Amendment (to the Constitution of the United States) related to church and religion, and what that intention means for clergy in relation to what they may or may not speak about in church.

Audience and Scope

This bibliography plan is primarily intended for church-going citizens of the United States. Clergy members are a potential secondary audience, if they are looking for clarity on the topic. For the first 150 years of the existence of the religion clauses in the First Amendment (“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;”) they went “virtually unnoticed” (Lardner, 1951). The reason, it is suggested, is because “it was widely understood that the Bill of Rights was not binding on the states... [and] was limited to restraining only the actions of the national government” (Seib, 2013). Then, in 1947, with the Supreme Court case of *Everson v. Board of Education*, the religion clauses began to gain attention. Since that time, “a veritable cottage industry of important new books, articles, briefs, and judicial opinions has emerged devoted to the history of separation of church and

state” (Whitte, Jr., 2006), yet there still seems to be confusion and debate as to the intention of what has come to be known as the Establishment Clause: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.”

The initial focus of the research for this bibliography plan is to determine the intent (or at least the most widely-accepted understanding of the intent) of the Establishment Clause, which has been associated with the phrase “separation of church and state.” The plan is to determine the intent using the following categories of databases: law, political science, and theology and religion.

The second focus of the research for this bibliography plan is to establish what, if anything, the clause means for clergy. In other words, what are clergy allowed – or not allowed – to say regarding the state (government, politics) in church. To establish this, theology and religion databases will be used, as well as history databases and general/multidisciplinary databases.

The Research Process

I began my research using databases found on the St. Catherine University library website. The first category, or subject area, I selected was political science. The first database I explored was PAIS Index. Searching “separation of church and state” was the most beneficial, yielding articles that gave an overview of the topic and a history of the phrase “separation of church and state.” My attention was drawn to an article that mentioned that the doctrine of church and state was primarily conceived “to keep the state out of the church” (Owens, 2001). The article, “Thomas Jefferson’s Retrospective on the Establishment Clause” (Smith, 2003) was interesting, in that I hadn’t previously heard the first of the religion clauses referred to as the “Establishment Clause.” That led me to searching using the phrase “Establishment Clause”;

SOURCE 1: PAIS Index		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
"separation of church and state"	663	somewhat
"separation of church and state" w/"peer reviewed" box checked	291	yes
"establishment clause" w/"peer reviewed" box checked	281	no
"church & state" w/"peer reviewed" box checked	507	no
"church & state" AND legislation w/"peer reviewed" box checked	132	no
"church & state" AND legislation AND "united states" w/"peer reviewed" box checked	96	no
"church and state" AND (U S constitution) w/"peer reviewed" box checked	82	no

however, the majority of results produced were regarding specific court cases and didn’t yield any particularly useful information. Many results from the “separation of church and state” search pertained to religion in schools, such as saying “God,” reading from the Bible, or organized prayer. I found the article “Unashamed of the Gospel of Jesus Christ: On Public Policy and Public Service by Evangelicals” to be informative, as it stated that the Supreme Court often uses the “neutrality norm . . . which protects those who believe a religious tenet to the same extent that it protects those who do not [to guide] the proper interpretation of the Religion Clauses” (Buckles, 2018).

The second database I selected from the political science category was JSTOR. I struggled a bit with this database. Perhaps I would’ve had more success if I’d used the same search terms I used with PAIS Index, but I wanted to try some new ones. The initial search was too broad, and modifying the search by selecting “religion” as the subject, though greatly reducing the number of results, did not produce the desired information. I then took a moment to look at Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), thinking that might yield more beneficial

SOURCE 2: JSTOR		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
("church and state") AND ("united states constitution")	798	no
("church and state") AND ("united states constitution"), refined by selecting "religion" subject	89	no
[(freedom of religion) AND (united states)]	136,380	no
[("freedom of religion") AND ("united states")]	5,053	no
[("freedom of religion") AND ("united states")] refined by selecting "religion" subject	575	no
[("first amendment") AND (religion)]	12,165	no
[("first amendment") AND ("freedom of religion")] refined by selecting "religion" subject	220	somewhat

search terms. These are the authorized headings I was able to find:

- Church and state (variants: Christianity and state; Separation of church and state; State and church)
- Freedom of religion (variants: Freedom of religion--Law and legislation; Freedom of worship; Intolerance; Liberty of religion; Religious freedom; Religious liberty; Separation of church and state)
- Liberty—Religious aspects [variants: Freedom (Theology)]

Utilizing some of the LCSH was fairly helpful, yet I found many searches to be way too broad (even when I used “United States” to try and narrow the search, in order that fewer results pertaining to other countries would be shown). That said, I found a very valuable article that explained that it isn’t the First Amendment religion clauses that forbid clergy from endorsing or opposing political candidates, it “is based on a provision in the 1954 tax reform act prohibiting all tax-exempt organizations from supporting or opposing political candidates” (Davidson, 1998). That information prompted me to go to IRS.gov to verify that that restriction is still in

place, which it is (*The Restriction of Political Campaign Intervention by Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Organizations* / Internal Revenue Service, n.d.).

Next, I searched the SAGE Knowledge database. I found some excellent sources of information from this database. Maurianne Adams’ entry in *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education* was especially informative with regard to the history of the phrase “separation of church and state” and was very well-articulated and understandable. In the *Encyclopedia of Religion in America*, Charles Lippy and Peter Williams elaborate on the “complex cultural, social, and legal history” of the First Amendment and note, “it has been subject to divergent legal interpretations, and it has been affected by the nation's political processes and cultural sensibilities, meaning that the limits on—and possibilities for—religious freedom have shifted over the course of American history” (Lippy & Williams, 2010). They also note that the intention of the two religion clauses of the First Amendment “continues to be a source of debate among legal scholars and historians” (Lippy & Williams, 2010).

SOURCE 3: SAGE Knowledge		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
"separation of church and state" AND "First Amendment"	162	yes
"freedom of religion" AND "united states"	264	somewhat
"freedom of religion" AND "united states" filtered out "entire works"	216	somewhat

An entry in the *Encyclopedia of Educational Reform and Dissent* discusses “separation” as it relates to schools: “Public schools are not allowed to promote nor prohibit religious belief or nonbelief. Public schools are obligated to protect the freedom of conscience of every student” (Kennedy, 2010). Interestingly, “more than two thirds of the Court's establishment cases since 1947 have involved public education” (Adams, 2012). In the *Encyclopedia of Political Communication*, Justin Martin suggests that “[r]eligion and politics in the United States are tied

inextricably to one another” (Martin, 2008), and that religion has had considerable impact on politics, which is particularly evident around issues such as stem-cell research, same-sex marriage, and abortion.

Next, I shifted to databases categorized under law and searched LegalTrac, which I anticipated would provide valuable resources for clarifying the intentions of the religion clauses of the First Amendment, and found a few articles with information that built upon what I’d learned thus far in the search process. Interestingly, an *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* article penned by Douglas Laycock, was written for a French audience, so it explains the concept of “separation of church and state” for people with no background information on the subject:

Separation of church and state requires that government be separated from religion, and thus that government itself be secular. Separation means that government is not to sponsor religion, and also, although this point gets less emphasis in the rhetoric of separation, government is not to interfere with religion. (Laycock, 2006).

Derek H. Davis, in his article for the *Journal of Church and State*, stated that U.S. Supreme Court Justice William A. Rehnquist, disagreed with Thomas Jefferson’s metaphor that the Establishment Clause built “a wall of separation between church and State” and believed it to be “misleading” and “highly simplified” (Davis, 2003). Rehnquist argued that the Establishment Clause:

“forbade establishment of a national religion, and forbade preference among religious sects or denominations... The ‘wall of separation between church and state’ is a metaphor based on bad history, a metaphor which has proved useless as a guide to judging. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned” (Davis, 2003).

In other words, the “wall” metaphor is not an accurate reflection of the true meaning of the Establishment Clause. According to Davis (2003), “a near majority of the current Supreme Court justices have rejected the ‘wall’ metaphor and are now unwittingly at work to adopt a new metaphor—‘equal treatment’--which enshrines nonpreferentialism, [and] permits a host of religious activities in the public realm in the name of ‘free exercise.’”

The next two databases I searched, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy and Philosopher’s Index, were listed under the St. Kate’s database subject heading of “Theology & Religion,” so I thought they might provide insight on the topic from the perspective of the church. Unfortunately, neither site was terribly helpful. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy results provided articles that were interesting, but didn’t really fit with the scope of my project. While there were some articles that looked promising that resulted from searches in Philosopher’s Index, I was not able to access those virtually.

SOURCE 5: Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
"church and state"	24	no
"separation of church and state"	13	no
"liberty--religious aspects"	0	no
"freedom of religion"	20	no
"first amendment" AND religion	7	no

SOURCE 6: Philosopher's Index		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
"separation of church and state" AND "first amendment" AND religion	3	no
religion AND "first amendment"	18	no

At this point in my researching, I switched my focus to determine what is allowed, or not allowed, to be spoken in church regarding government and/or politics. I began with the America:

History & Life database. I initially used terms similar to what I’d been using, but soon realized I would continue retrieving similar results. Therefore, I switched up the search terms, hoping to find more information on the *church* side of “separation of church and state” and less on the *state* side. The difficulty was in determining the search terms to utilize.

SOURCE 7: America: History & Life		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
"separation of church and state" AND "united states"	223	somewhat
"politics in church"	96	no
preaching AND politics	49	no
politics AND (sermons OR preaching)	127	no

The results I found in this database primarily dealt with the influence that religious groups have historically had (or still have) on American government and politics; however, I did find an article in *Social Science Quarterly (Wiley-Blackwell)*, in which results of a survey of clergy in the Presbyterian Church suggested:

“that clergy look to cues from both their congregations and denominational leaders when electing to deliver a sermon. What is more, clergy report feeling pressure from their congregational constituencies to behave in ways that they do not prefer. This pressure also impacts their decision to sermonize” (Calfano, 2009).

In other words, based on cues clergy receive, they may actually censor that about which they intend to preach, change to another topic altogether, or feel pressured to preach in support of a standpoint with which they disagree. This information doesn’t suggest there are specific topics that can or cannot be discussed in a sermon, but I found it to be interesting, in that it aligns with what I’ve observed at Peace, when Pastor Mark has been receiving pressure from members to “be careful” what he preaches about, in order to avoid coming across as “too political.”

At this point in my research, I was getting frustrated with trying to come up with search terms that would yield results pertaining to whether or not clergy are allowed to speak about politics in their sermons. As much as I was trying to avoid it, I chose Google Scholar, as I am probably the most familiar with that database (or with Google in general). In desperation, thinking that maybe I could at least get some ideas for search terms, I entered the phrase “can pastors talk about politics.” Ridiculous, I know. The search yielded more than 60,000 results. Other search terms yielded narrower results, but most did not lead me to that for which I was searching. One article, “When Church Becomes State: Electioneering and the Culture of Fear and Race in the 2008 Presidential Election,” did reiterate an earlier finding regarding tax

SOURCE 8: Google Scholar		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
can pastors talk about politics	60,000+	no
"politics in the church"	454	no
"politics in the church" AND "united states"	253	no
"politics in the church" AND "united states" -sex*	126	no

exemption: “Tax-exempt organizations . . . cannot conduct activities that influence legislation or voting” (Flint-Hamilton, 2010). The article also stated that “[p]riests and ministers are allowed to advocate for a certain candidate or policy—that is their civil right—but they cannot do so during religious services or on church property” (p.42).

I proceeded to another database, Issues & Controversies. After searching “pulpit politics” with minimal success, I decided to search issues by subject (since I was struggling to come up with search terms), which was somewhat helpful, though the results produced from each set of search terms used were nearly identical (plus or minus a few results). After scanning a few of the articles, I began to search through the bibliographies of the articles to look for other resources or

possible search terms. This was very useful and yielded an interesting transcript from an NPR broadcast. As heard on NPR’s “All Things Considered,” an effort called the “Pulpit Initiative”

SOURCE 9: Issues & Controversies		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
pulpit politics	5	somewhat
Separation of Church and State (from website's issues menu)	10	somewhat
Religion in Politics (from website's issues menu)	6	somewhat
Pastors and Politics (from website's issues menu)	5	somewhat

was to take place on Sunday, September 28, 2008. The “Pulpit Initiative” was “a nationwide effort to violate the [then] 54-year-old ban on political preaching and endorse or oppose a candidate from the pulpit” (Hagerty, 2008). The “ban” is referring to 1954 tax reform (often referred to as the Johnson Amendment), under which “all section 501(c)(3) organizations are absolutely prohibited from directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office” (*The Restriction of Political Campaign Intervention by Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Organizations / Internal Revenue Service*, n.d.).

Until the 1954 tax reform, churches were actually allowed to endorse candidates, and there are many who argue that should be the case again today. A pro/con article entitled “Pastors and Politics: Should church pastors and other religious leaders be allowed to endorse political candidates?” (2008) asserts, funnily enough, “Both sides in the debate evoke the First Amendment to the Constitution in their defense. The First Amendment protects free expression, banning laws ‘abridging the freedom of speech.’ It also prevents the enactment of any laws ‘respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.’”

Moving on to the Gale General OneFile database, I found a few helpful articles, as well as some new ideas for search terms. *Church & State* (2012) reported that top IRS officials gave a presentation of the facts of the law “at an event for African-American clergy to remind religious leaders that federal law prohibits houses of worship from endorsing or opposing candidates for public office.” In the height of an election year, it seems wise for clergy to be reminded of the requirements of the law, so as not to say something that could jeopardize their churches’ tax-exemption status.

The Christian Century (2018) published eleven pastors’ and theologians’ responses to the following questions: “Should pastors and congregations seek to transcend politics or is that an impossible or even illegitimate goal? Is there a difference between being political and being partisan?” Lee Hull Moses, pastor of First Christian Church in Greensboro, North Carolina, stated, “It’s complicated by the fact that ‘politics’ has now come to mean any contemporary issue on which people might disagree” (“Do Politics Belong in Church? Eleven Responses,” 2018). Similarly, in a *Leadership Today* article, Joel C. Hunter, pastor of Northland Church, a multi-site congregation in central Florida, states, “Much of evangelical politics has gotten stuck in a petty ‘middle-school mentality’ where we define ourselves by who we hate and what clique we belong to.” And, in the same article, Efrem Smith, pastor of The Sanctuary Covenant Church in Minneapolis, expresses frustration that “many kingdom issues have been politicized, so that even when you preach on a biblical issue, people will criticize you for being political” (“Does Your Preaching Touch Politics? Four Biblical Perspectives,” 2008).

Pastor Moses’ use of the phrase “contemporary issue” prompted me to use that as a search term. No helpful results were found; however, I did find other potential search terms

while scanning the results, which finally gave me the confidence to look for LCSH for this half of the research (initially, I couldn’t quite work out what to look for in LCSH).

SOURCE 10: Gale General OneFile		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
pastors AND politics AND "united states"	125	yes
(current OR contemporary) AND issues AND pulpit	8	no
"social justice issues" AND church	112	no

The LCSH that seemed likely to be most useful:

- Social justice
- Religion and social problems (variants: Social action--Religious aspects; Social problems and religion)
- Church and social problems (variants: Christianity and social problems; Social problems and Christianity; Social problems and the church)

While I didn’t necessarily find these specific terms to actually be all that useful, they helped me discern the direction I wanted to go with the search terms I did choose to use.

Academic Search Premier is the database I used next. The first set of search terms yielded one applicable result, but I’d already retrieved that article from another database. The next two sets of search terms weren’t particularly helpful, but the last one I used for this database generated a couple of articles I found to be interesting and applicable.

SOURCE 11: Academic Search Premier		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
"politics in the church" AND "united states" NOT sex	22	somewhat
politics AND (pastors or clergy or minister) AND church; modified by selecting peer rev journals	455	no
political activism AND (pastors or clergy or minister) AND church AND united states; 2000-2021; academic journals	26	no
preaching AND politics AND church AND united states	29	yes

In “Preaching in a Politically Divided Age: In an Interview with Luis Leon and Randolph (Randy) Marshall Hollerith,” published in *Anglican Theological Review* (2019), Hollerith contends:

Proclaiming the gospel is always going to rock the boat. Whether it is on a personal or a political level, the way of Jesus challenges us to be better than we are (p. 101). The primary biblical themes of God’s justice, mercy, love, and forgiveness must always transcend the political realities of the day. . . . We are called not only to critique our way of life as Americans, but also to proclaim a vision for the world as God sees it. . . .any preaching that attempts to address current political realities falls short if it does not offer a counter vision of God’s dream for the world (p. 103).

In another article from the same issue of *Anglican Theological Review*, Robert Wright, in his commentary asserts:

Speaking about contemporary issues from the pulpit is dangerous business. Still, the preacher must not actively avoid contemporary issues at the risk of muzzling the gospel. It sounds like an obvious point, but the issue du jour must not be central to the sermon; rather, the gospel must be the reason for the address. The biblical text must not be dragged kicking and screaming into a conversation about headlines (pp. 121-122).

Both Hollerith and Wright acknowledge the challenges clergy face in preaching about current issues, yet they both stress the importance of doing so – as long as the message of the gospel remains the central focus.

Having found the pro/con articles on the Issues & Controversies database to be an interesting way of approaching a topic, I decided to check out the Points of View Reference

Center database. I was pleased to find articles that affirmed that clergy are allowed to preach on current issues and injustices, even though some people misconstrue that as “political” speech.

SOURCE 12: Points of View Reference Center		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
separation of church and state	1	yes
preaching AND politics AND church AND united states	10	somewhat
"social justice" AND preaching	49	somewhat
pastors AND politics AND "united states"	170	somewhat

In his 2004 article for *America*, entitled “Politics and the Parish,” Vincent Miller acknowledges that “[c]hurches must avoid direct partisan advocacy in elections and must be careful to respect the rights, wisdom and prudence of their diverse members to make political decisions” but not to the extent that they “slide into the social convention of polite society that considers direct and specific talk about politics and religion to be impolite and polarizing.”

While clergy generally want all people to be united and feel welcome – regardless of political beliefs or affiliations – Miller cautions that “[s]uch unity is, however, always in danger of being achieved at the cost of ignoring the difficult demands of the Gospel.” Though it might be easier to avoid discussing certain social problems or current issues that may be construed as “political,” if there is an issue of injustice, and the gospel speaks to the heart of the matter, the issue should be discussed and not deemed off-limits to clergy. As Robert Drinan, professor at Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D.C. explains in his 2001 *America* article, “Preaching Social Justice in Homilies,” there are “countless ways in which the Bible repeatedly stresses that the people of God must be devoted to justice in every way.”

It was interesting to learn, via the 2011 *Humanist* article, “Pastors & Politics,” written by Larry Keller, that clergy has a lot more freedom with regard to politics than I’d originally understood:

Despite the religious right's assertions that the disputed section of the IRS code curtails free speech, the truth is that pastors have a great deal of freedom. They can sponsor voter registration drives at their churches, which can be the site of a polling precinct. They can personally endorse or oppose candidates and work for or against them on their personal time. They are only barred from putting their church's imprimatur on such activity--such as placing campaign signs on church property, or endorsing candidates from the pulpit or in letters on church letterhead (p.30).

This information affirmed what I’d believed about Pastor Mark having the right to sign the “Open Letter...” and to post his having done so on his personal Facebook page. Had he done so on Peace’s Facebook page, it would’ve been a different story.

The final database I used was MasterFILE Complete, which yielded an article that ties in with the sentiment of the *America* articles referenced earlier – that clergy can and should preach justice. In their 2010 article for *Anglican Theological Review*, “Practicing the Justice of God,” Gary Commins and Anna Olson, in reference to Micah 6:8, which states “What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?”, note that “...most people just want something to get them through the week. ‘Love kindness, and walk humbly with your God.’ That feels manageable to people trying to get through the week. But something is missing” (p. 762).

SOURCE 13: MasterFILE Complete		
SEARCH TERMS	RESULTS	USEFUL?
"church and social problems"; 2010-2021	119	somewhat
(separation of church and state) AND preaching	19	no
(politics in church) AND preaching	14	yes

Another useful result from MasterFILE Complete was a book review. Normally, I’d skim over a book review in search of an actual book, journal article or other resource, but the title of the book intrigued me. In 2019, Clint Schnekloth reviewed *Preaching in the Purple Zone: Ministry in the Red-Blue Divide*, by Leah Schade, for *Christian Century* and highlighted the author’s focus on using a “sermon-dialogue-sermon method” in order to engage the congregation in conversations around difficult topics. Only parts of the book were available online, so I purchased the eBook in order to read more about Schade’s approach. Schade, quoting homiletician Richard Voelz, notes:

“Worshipping communities can neither retreat simply to inconclusive spiritual reflection nor engage in knee-jerk actions to issues as they come up.” This fight-or-flight response simply will not do for Christians, because the fact is that the church “participates in the wider spheres of public life,” whether leaders and parishioners choose to acknowledge this or not (Schade, 2019, p. 42).

What I understand this to mean is that, whether we want to admit it or not, the church is *in* the public world. Church leaders need to equip their members to live out their faith within that public world – controversial issues, social problems, politics and all – and members need to be prepared to accept that.

Conclusion

This bibliography plan assignment greatly challenged and (blessedly) improved what were, at best, lackluster research skills. When I chose the topic for this bibliography plan, I was excited to find the information I was seeking and also concerned that there might not be enough information to warrant my chosen topic. Thankfully, a wealth of information was to be had. The biggest challenge was coming up with search terms for the focus of the second half of the project, which led to much frustration for a while. Scanning bibliographies of resources was helpful for finding other resources and sometimes other ideas for search terms.

Before searching any databases, I created a spreadsheet to document the databases, search terms, results, and usefulness of the results (these were transferred into the bib plan document as I wrote the paper). To the right of the “Useful?” column of my spreadsheet, I kept track of notes regarding why I’d ranked search terms the way I did. I also created a document to make notes about the databases themselves and a page for references with notes about each of the references; I entered these in the order in which I found them, so they’d be in order by databases searched. These documents came in very handy when it was time to write the paper.

Prior to starting the paper, I printed the document that listed the references and notes about the references so I could highlight them as I used them in the paper. This was helpful, as there were a few I chose not to use, and when it came time to finalize the references page, it was easy to eliminate references that I hadn’t ended up using. One thing I wish I’d done with each reference is note the database used. They were in order by databases searched, but I couldn’t always tell where results from one ended and the next began and often ended up redoing searches to figure it out so I could put them in the correct section of the paper.

I am pleased with the amount and variety of information found regarding my topic and feel confident that I could explain to a congregation member how the phrase “separation of church and state” originated and what it means for clergy. I look forward to discussing it with Pastor Mark, who has asked me to share what I think will benefit him from my findings.

Appendix A: Sample Annotations

Adams, M. (2012). Separation of church and state. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 1, pp. 1935-1941). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://www-doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.4135/9781452218533.n614>

This encyclopedia entry establishes the historical context of the religion clauses of the First Amendment and how the phrase “separation of church and state” came to be associated with those clauses. The author presents a timeline of evolving perspectives on the separation of church and state based on U.S. demographics and highlights key court cases that brought attention to the First Amendment religion clauses. She also draws attention to the inconsistencies in court rulings that apply to religious minorities and discusses the application of the clauses as they apply to educators. At the end of this very thorough and accessible resource, the author provides the names of educational groups that offer tools for educators, students and parents to further their understanding of this topic.

Davidson, J. (1998). Why churches cannot endorse or oppose political candidates. *Review of Religious Research*, 40(1), 16-34. <https://doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.2307/3512457>

This journal article explains that the reason churches cannot oppose or favor political candidates is not because of the religion clauses of the First Amendment but because of a tax reform act passed in 1954. Churches can lose their tax-exempt status if they endorse (or oppose) a political candidate. The author provides background information regarding what likely prompted Lyndon Johnson to propose the tax reform, and asserts that it had nothing to do with the separation of church and state and everything to do with partisan politics. Davidson makes a compelling argument.

Davis, D. H. (2003). Thomas Jefferson and the "wall of separation" metaphor. *Journal of Church and State*, 45(1), 5+.

This journal article offers a detailed explanation of the historical context of the phrase “separation of church and state” as a metaphor for the First Amendment and points out that Thomas Jefferson, who is most often credited with the origination of the phrase, wasn’t the first to use it. The author also provides arguments used both in support of and in opposition to the use of the phrase in establishing the intentions of the First Amendment religion clauses. In the tone of the article, it seems clear he is opposed to discrediting the application of the metaphor, but that doesn’t make the information any less interesting or useful.

Do politics belong in church? Eleven responses. (2018, October 10). *The Christian Century*, 135(21), 20+.

This journal article provides the diverse perspectives of eleven pastors and theologians across the United States regarding the discussion of politics or political issues in church. As a whole, those interviewed recognize that congregations are made up of people on both sides of the aisle, and pastors must proceed with caution when discussing contemporary issues that may be construed as “political.” That is not to say, however, that those subjects should be avoided, and most advocate for discussing the issues and applying the understanding of their practiced faith. They give varied and compelling suggestions for how best to accomplish this.

Pastors and Politics: Should church pastors and other religious leaders be allowed to endorse political candidates? (2008, October 31). *Issues & Controversies*.

This well-written pro/con article highlights the ongoing debate about whether or not clergy should be allowed to endorse (or oppose) political candidates. It provides clearly-defined arguments on each side of the debate for eliminating the IRS tax code banning electioneering and gives a history of the debate since the tax code’s creation in 1954.

Schade, L. D. (2019). *Preaching in the purple zone: Ministry in the red-blue divide*. Rowman & Littlefield.

In this book, the author provides an overview of her own experiences with preaching on difficult topics, as well as those of other religious leaders. She gives background information about why people are bothered by hearing clergy preach on the injustices of the day and stresses the importance of gaining the trust of the congregation in order to be able to discuss those issues. Schade advocates for a conversational or dialogical approach to preaching and offers instructions for preparing a congregation for what she calls “purple zone preaching,” which requires congregation participation. She also provides a sample newsletter for announcing the topic and dates for upcoming dialogues, as well as options for planning dialogue sessions and a “cheat sheet” of questions to facilitate the dialogue sessions. This book is equally a how-to and *why-to* resource for clergy looking to bring their congregations into a more active role in the discussion and preaching of difficult topics.

Appendix B: References

- Adams, M. (2012). Separation of church and state. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 1, pp. 1935-1941). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://www-doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.4135/9781452218533.n614>
- Bailey, E., & Newton, H. (2020). Separation of church and state: An overview. *Points of View: Separation of Church & State*, 1–N.PAG.
- Buckles, J. R. (2018). Unashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ: On public policy and public service by Evangelicals. *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 41(3), 813–899.
- Calfano, B. R. (2009). Choosing constituent cues: Reference group influence on clergy political speech. *Social Science Quarterly (Wiley-Blackwell)*, 90(1), 88–102. <https://doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00604.x>
- Commins, G., & Olson, A. (2010). Practicing the justice of God. *Anglican Theological Review*, 92(4), 761–768.
- Davidson, J. (1998). Why churches cannot endorse or oppose political candidates. *Review of Religious Research*, 40(1), 16-34. <https://doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.2307/3512457>
- Davis, D. H. (2003). Thomas Jefferson and the "wall of separation" metaphor. *Journal of Church and State*, 45(1), 5+.
- Do politics belong in church? Eleven responses. (2018, October 10). *The Christian Century*, 135(21), 20+.
- Does your preaching touch politics? Four biblical perspectives. (2008). *Leadership Journal*, 29(3), 32+.
- Drinan, R. F. (2001). Preaching social justice in homilies. *America*, 184(4), 23–24.

Flint-Hamilton, K. (2010). When church becomes state: Electioneering and the culture of fear and race in the 2008 presidential election. *U.S. Catholic Historian*, 28(1), 41–52.

Hagerty, B. B. (2008, September 24). Pastors to preach politics from the pulpit. In *All Things Considered*. NPR. <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=95003709>

IRS reminds churches not to engage in partisan electioneering. (2012, September). *Church & State*, 65(8), 20.

Keller, L. (2011). Pastors & politics. *Humanist*, 71(1), 28–31.

Kennedy, R. (2010). Separation of church and state. In T. C. Hunt, J. C. Carper, & T. J. Lasley (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of educational reform and dissent* (pp. 811-812). SAGE

Publications, Inc., <https://www-doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.4135/9781412957403.n394>

Lardner, L. (1951). How far does the constitution separate church and state? *The American Political Science Review*, 45(1), 110-132. <https://doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.2307/1950886>

Laycock, D. (2006). Church and state in the United States: Competing conceptions and historic changes. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 13(2), 503+.

Lippy, C. H., & Williams, P. W. (2010). Church and state: Revolutionary period and early republic. In *Encyclopedia of religion in America* (pp. 450-460). CQ Press, <https://www-doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.4135/9781608712427.n72>

Lippy, C. H., & Williams, P. W. (2010). Freedom, religious. In *Encyclopedia of religion in America* (pp. 863-870). CQ Press, <https://www-doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.4135/9781608712427.n138>

- Martin, J. (2008). Religion in politics. In L. L. Kaid, & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of political communication* (Vol. 1, pp. 707-710). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://www-doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.4135/9781412953993.n579>
- Miller, V. J. (2004). Politics and the parish. *America*, 191(4), 18–20.
- Owens, R. F. (2001). Separation of church and state. (Issues). *Social Policy*, 32(1), 45+.
- Pastors and Politics: Should church pastors and other religious leaders be allowed to endorse political candidates? (2008, October 31). *Issues & Controversies*.
- Preaching in a politically divided age: An interview with Luis León and Randolph (Randy) Marshall Hollerith. (2019). *Anglican Theological Review*, 101(1), 97–104.
- Schade, L. D. (2019). *Preaching in the purple zone: Ministry in the red-blue divide*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schnekloth, C. (2019). Preaching in the purple zone: Ministry in the red-blue divide. *Christian Century*, 136(18), 39–40.
- Seib, P. (2013). Religious freedom and US public diplomacy. *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 11(1), 15–21. <https://doi-org.pearl.stkate.edu/10.1080/15570274.2012.760980>
- Smith, D. G. (2003). Thomas Jefferson’s retrospective on the Establishment Clause. *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 26(1), 369.
- The Restriction of Political Campaign Intervention by Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Organizations* / Internal Revenue Service. (n.d.). <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/the-restriction-of-political-campaign-intervention-by-section-501c3-tax-exempt-organizations>

Whitte, J., Jr. (2006). Facts and fictions about the history of separation of church and state.

Journal of Church and State, 48(1), 15+.

Wright, R. C. (2019). Preaching on issues of the day. *Anglican Theological Review*, 101(1), 117–122.