

Studies Center at the University of Oklahoma, based on the papers of Albert, a former Speaker of the House. If these centers were to pool resources with the smaller repositories and universities around the country, the study of Congress could be greatly facilitated.

Much work can be done from the comfort of one's home university. Interlibrary loan can yield offsite primary sources, including unpublished congressional oral histories, diaries, and memoirs. Unpublished dissertations and theses can also prove useful, once unearthed with the help of dedicated university librarians. Congressional documents are also becoming available online. Committee hearings and the *Congressional Record* are now just a few clicks away, with keyword searches eliminating daunting forays into the dusty basements of official U.S. government repositories. Ultimately, however, given the primacy of hands-on archival research, a Congress-U.S. foreign relations topic might be determined by what archival material is available at the historian's home or nearby university.

The biggest help congressional scholars can receive is in terms of methodology and funding. Scholars of Congress and U.S. foreign relations must work with their advisers to devise a research plan that is reasonable, yet also path-breaking; advisers must help their graduate students do work that is fulfilling but also helps them get the coveted tenure-track job. Also, congressional archives need to entice scholars monetarily to come and do research. Most of the NARA presidential archives have competitive research grants. The Dirksen Center, to its credit, has offered grants to scholars for decades. The Oregon Historical Society has a fellowship to support a multi-week residency. More universities and historical societies should step up and help scholars, and not just scholars of congressional history.

The money is not going to appear overnight, of course. But whether or not we are able to get financial assistance to go to congressional archives, we should consider it doing it anyway, as it should be apparent to us now that Congress matters. We have the tools to be able to access at least some congressional records relevant to our projects. Let's go and do the work.

#### Notes:

1. Robert David Johnson, "Congress and the Cold War," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 3, no. 2 (Spring 2001): 76–100; Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War* (New York, 2006).
2. Johnson, "Congress and the Cold War," 78.
3. For example, the papers of noteworthy Republican senators Mark Hatfield, Robert Packwood, and Slade Gorton remain closed to the public.
4. Thomas W. Zeiler, "The Diplomatic History Bandwagon: A State of the Field," *Journal of American History* 95, no. 4 (March 2009): 1053–73.
5. For examples, see Matthew A. Wasniewski, ed., *Women in Congress, 1917–2006* (Washington, DC, U.S. Government Printing Office, 2007); and "Women in Congress," <http://history.house.gov/Exhibition-and-Publications/WIC/Women-in-Congress/> (September 12, 2015).
6. Melvin Small, *Democracy and Diplomacy: The Impact of Domestic Politics on U.S. Foreign Policy, 1789–1994* (Baltimore, 1996).
7. Julian Zelizer, *Arsenal of Democracy: The Politics of National Security From World War II to the War on Terrorism* (New York, 2010), 3.
8. Joseph A. Fry, *Debating Vietnam: Fulbright, Stennis, and Their Senate Hearings* (Lanham, MD, 2006), viii.
9. Andrew L. Johns, *Vietnam's Second Front: Domestic Politics, The Republican Party, and the War* (Lexington, KY, 2010).
10. See, for example: LeRoy Ashby and Rod Gramer, *Fighting the Odds: The Life of Senator Frank Church* (Pullman, WA, 1994); Shelby Scates, Warren G. Magnuson and the Shaping of Twentieth-Century America (Seattle, 1997); Jeffrey R. Biggs and Thomas S. Foley, *Honor in the House: Speaker Tom Foley* (Pullman, WA, 1999).
11. For a persuasive argument along this line, see Barbara Hinckley, *Less Than Meets the Eye: Foreign Policy Making and the Myth of an Assertive Congress* (Chicago, 1994).

12. One recent work that does this well is Guangqiu Xu, *Congress and the U.S.-China Relationship, 1949–1979* (Akron, 2007).

13. Fosdick's work can, however, be useful to Jackson scholars: see Dorothy Fosdick, ed., *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches, 1953–1983* (Seattle, 1983); Dorothy Fosdick, *Staying the Course: Henry M. Jackson and National Security* (Seattle, 1987).

14. Marie B. Rosenberg-Dishman, "Women In Politics: A Comparative Study of Congresswomen Edith Green and Julia Butler Hansen" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1973).

15. Janann Sherman, *No Place For a Woman: A Life of Senator Margaret Chase Smith* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2000). Notably, Smith served on the House Naval Affairs Committee during World War II and on the Senate Armed Services Committee during the Vietnam War.

## Religion as Domestic Politics in American Foreign Relations

Daniel G. Hummel

While the role of religion in the twentieth-century American foreign affairs has been the subject of a slew of studies in the past decade, the role of religion in domestic politics has received less direct attention. Treating religion as part of politics casts light on the more pragmatic dimensions of religion in American foreign policy: the influence of religio-political coalitions in elections, the role of party platforms and grassroots organizations in shaping policy agendas, and the role of the media in shaping perspectives on American religion.

Andrew Preston's recent survey on religion and foreign affairs provides some insights into how religion's role in domestic politics might play a more prominent part in the field. As he writes in the introduction to *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith*, politics has historically been the arena where "popular religion and elite diplomacy" meet. "Religious communities and elites spoke to each other in a continual effort to try to convince one another of what should be done in U.S. foreign policy. The religious influence [in foreign policy], then, was the product of continual dialogue. It was at heart a political process."<sup>1</sup> Viewing religious influence as a political process highlights the structural power of the United States' largest religious communities (for much of the twentieth century Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish), which have been enduring fixtures of American politics and foreign affairs. It also expands the scope of the analysis of religion, taking us beyond the religious language that bolstered manifest destiny, beyond the religious imagery of American exceptionalism, and beyond discussions of how religious beliefs influenced particular policymakers.

Preston's original call in 2005 for historians to "bridge the gap" between religion and American foreign relations and "to take religion seriously" was succeeded by a robust body of literature.<sup>2</sup> This new literature builds upon the work of an influential group of scholars who had been exploring themes of religion in American foreign affairs for a long time.<sup>3</sup> But as Preston observes, the way these diplomatic historians understand religion and religious motivation varies. For some, religion approximates a sort of ideology rooted in beliefs, while for others it dictates social structures and cultural patterns. This central problem of definition has made its role in the study of domestic politics and foreign affairs more difficult to assess.

For many diplomatic historians, religion has functioned primarily as a source of American idealism.<sup>4</sup> Periods of intense nationalist sentiment—World War I, the first two decades of the Cold War, the Vietnam War—have proven fertile ground for the study of religion in American foreign affairs.<sup>5</sup> Much of the recent boom in the study of religion and foreign affairs has likewise centered on how the beliefs of individual policymakers (such as Woodrow Wilson) or more abstract notions of civil religion and American exceptionalism have shaped American policy.<sup>6</sup> Recent works by William Inboden, Seth Jacobs, and Melani

McAlister have demonstrated the ideological linkage between religious understandings of the world and views on American foreign affairs.<sup>7</sup>

The difficulty of linking the issue of religion in politics to diplomatic history is at least twofold. First is the basic problem of the role of religious convictions in shaping American attitudes toward foreign affairs. One important insight from scholars of religion is that the link between religious beliefs and political action is constantly contested.<sup>8</sup> When there is a link, it has to be constructed, as religious actors themselves often lament.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, as Kenneth D. Wald and Allison Calhoun-Brown show in a recent sociological study, religious affiliation cannot reliably predict public opinion of foreign policy.<sup>10</sup> In some specific cases, such as President Bush's handling of the Iraq War, evangelicals and Latter-day Saints were more supportive than other religious groups. But on other issues, such as the ideal level of defense spending, there were no statistically significant differences between Catholics, evangelicals, and Jews. Thus, it is hard to link the mass of data available on American religious affiliation to voting preferences, and it is even harder to trace alleged linkages as they filter through foreign policymakers' calculations of their importance.

The second difficulty is understanding the precise ways in which policymakers and elected officials respond to religiously motivated politics. As with all domestic issues, election cycles, party coalitions, and media coverage can directly influence how an official or policymaker responds to religious lobbying. This fluidity is especially acute when it comes to the roles of domestic lobbying groups. Important questions arise over how the domestic politics of religion have influenced U.S. policy toward the state of Israel, for example, or Palestinians, or Arab states. Historians outside of diplomatic history have offered convincing cultural arguments for the enduring American interest in the concept of Israel. Yet for the most part these cultural approaches do not address domestic politics or policymaking.<sup>11</sup>

Diplomatic historians, on the other hand, have largely avoided forays into the beliefs of religious actors not directly involved in policymaking.<sup>12</sup> Even among policymakers, religious conviction is usually treated only as a supporting factor.<sup>13</sup> The difficulty in assessing what role domestic politics played in President Truman's decision to recognize Israel in 1948, for example, is compounded by the difficulty of establishing, as I have already mentioned, the actual role of religious convictions in shaping political attitudes.

These problems are in many ways integral to the study of religion and probably deter a number of scholars and graduate students from studying the intersection of religion, domestic politics, and foreign affairs. Even so, there is much potential in the treatment of religion as a domestic political factor that has influenced—sometimes decisively—the direction of American foreign affairs. Recent works by Markku Ruotsila, Paul Chamberlin, and Caitlin Carenen provide some important examples. These diplomatic historians have found religio-political issues with powerful domestic implications at the center of debates over key American policies.<sup>14</sup>

A number of historians in the field of American religious history have also explained more general American foreign policy attitudes by emphasizing religious beliefs. Matthew Sutton emphasizes the role of prophecy belief in anti-fascist and anti-communist politics among conservative Protestants in the 1930s.<sup>15</sup> Axel Schäfer shows how the politics of the Cold War led conservative evangelicals to

embrace public funding for religious institutions.<sup>16</sup> Mark Edwards finds the traditional "liberal" and "conservative" political labels to be unsatisfactory in explaining the appeal of Christian Realism to the Protestant establishment in the 1940s and 1950s, and instead focuses on intellectual and theological discourse.<sup>17</sup>

These works in diplomatic history (and the more unfamiliar religious history) point to a research agenda for approaching the role of religion in politics. By focusing on religious institutions (and anchoring studies in their archives), historians can chart the fluid relationship between policymakers and religious institutions. Indeed, by focusing on the nexus of religion and power—a focus of religious history that has recently been revitalized in studies on the Protestant establishment—we may better understand how religious institutions factor into domestic political calculations and why their influence fluctuates so widely.<sup>18</sup>

Complementing this institutional focus is our growing understanding of "bottom-up" and grassroots political activism in the United States. Consider, for example, the religious right and the late twentieth-century culture wars. While the culture wars are rarely discussed in the context of diplomatic history, their relevance can be seen in such issues as Reagan's military build-up in the 1980s or American responses to 9/11.<sup>19</sup> Insofar as the GOP has become "God's Own Party" and a stronghold for conservative Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish thinkers, the growing influence of religious coalitions in shaping and influencing the parameters of debate or the policies of the U.S. government promises to be a rich area of study.<sup>20</sup> In addition, as Mark Edwards has recently observed, with all the scholarly

attention to religious beliefs and foreign policy, the notably secular basis for most American foreign policymaking in the twentieth century becomes an interesting question in and of itself.<sup>21</sup> How does the political influence of religion at the grassroots level become dispersed at the policymaking level? Hopefully, addressing such questions will produce new methodological approaches in the field.

The new prominence of religious topics in SHAFR provides an unprecedented opportunity to advance our knowledge of religion in domestic politics. Although serious research and methodological limitations will always exist, and although historians should always guard against the risk of overloading one factor in explaining U.S. foreign affairs, recent works show the promise of treating religion as part of domestic politics. Especially in an era of growing religious pluralism, questions about the roles of religio-political coalitions in foreign policymaking need answers.

#### Notes:

1. Andrew Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (New York, 2012), 9–10.
2. Andrew Preston, "Bridging the Gap between the Sacred and the Secular in the History of American Foreign Relations," *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 5 (November 2006): 788.
3. See, for example, Andrew J. Rotter, "Christians, Muslims, and Hindus: Religion and U.S.-South Asian Relations, 1947–1954," *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (January 2000): 593–613.
4. This view goes back at least to Michael Hunt, who places religion alongside other forces shaping American ideology. See *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, 2009).
5. See, for example, Andrew Preston, "To Make the World Saved: American Religion and the Great War," *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 4 (September 2014): 813–25; Jonathan P. Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America's Religious Battle against Communism in*

Rasmus Sinding Søndergaard

Recent historical research on the relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy has examined a broad range of actors inside and outside government. As is evident in this roundtable, these actors have engaged an even broader range of policy issues, one of which is human rights. This essay surveys recent historical research on the role of human rights in American foreign policy—research that directly or indirectly addresses the role of domestic politics. It shows that historians have already benefited from adopting a domestic perspective in the examination of the role of human rights in American foreign policy and argues that this is an avenue that should be pursued further.

In recent years the study of human rights has emerged as a thriving subfield within the historical discipline.<sup>1</sup> Part of this subfield has been devoted to the role of human rights in American foreign policy, making human rights a buzzword within the field of U.S. diplomatic history. Sarah Snyder's review essay in the April 2013 edition of *Passport*, "Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Relations: A Historiographical Review," demonstrates this development. In her review Snyder notes that after having long been neglected by historians of America foreign relations, human rights has now "finally arrived."<sup>2</sup> If proof of the validity of that statement is necessary, one need only look at the program for this year's SHAFR meeting, which contained a myriad of panels dealing with human rights. In fact, the phrase 'human rights' figured no less than eighteen times in the program. The role of human rights in American foreign relations is thus clearly a historiographical topic that animates the SHAFR community.<sup>3</sup>

The human rights policies of presidential administrations have naturally received significant attention from diplomatic historians. Elizabeth Borgwardt contends that the international human rights regime came about as an American attempt to globalize the New Deal ideas rooted in Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Four Freedoms.<sup>4</sup> In recent years, several historians have taken advantage of the declassification of archives to examine the human rights policies of Jimmy Carter and, to a lesser extent, Ronald Reagan.<sup>5</sup> This scholarship indicates a clear domestic component to presidential human rights policy. For both Carter and Reagan the use of human rights language offered a way to mobilize public support for foreign policy agendas.<sup>6</sup>

However, when the dissonance between rhetoric and policy became too great, human rights could also become a public relations problem. As the American public became increasingly more concerned with human rights issues, it became necessary for presidents to at least appear to support human rights. Reagan, for example, met with a massive public outcry when he attempted to downgrade human rights early in his administration.<sup>7</sup> The examination of human rights, therefore, can offer insights into the relationship between domestic public opinion and foreign policy. In turn, looking at the relationship between public opinion and presidents can enhance our understanding of U.S. human rights policy.

An approach to the study of human rights policy that is arguably even more directly domestic can be found in the scholarship examining Congress. This research confirms that Congress forced human rights onto the political agenda in the 1970s through its hearings and passed legislation that tied foreign assistance to the human rights records of recipient countries and institutionalized human rights concerns in the State Department.<sup>8</sup> Once established, this human rights infrastructure proved remarkably

the Early Cold War (New York, 2011); David Settje, *Faith and War: How Christians Debated the Cold and Vietnam Wars* (New York, 2011); T. Jeremy Gunn, *Spiritual Weapons: The Cold War and the Forging of an American National Religion* (Westport, CT, 2008).

6. Milan Babik, *Statecraft and Salvation: Wilsonian Liberal Internationalism as Secularized Eschatology* (Waco, TX, 2013); Mark Benbow, *Leading Them to the Promised Land: Woodrow Wilson, Covenant Theology, and the Mexican Revolution, 1913–1915* (Kent, OH, 2010); Malcolm Magee, *What the World Should Be: Woodrow Wilson and the Crafting of a Faith-Based Foreign Policy* (Waco, TX, 2008).

7. William Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945–1960: The Soul of Containment* (Cambridge, UK, 2008); Seth Jacobs, *America's Miracle Man in Vietnam: Ngo Dinh Diem, Religion, Race, and U.S. Intervention in Southeast Asia, 1950–1957* (Durham, NC, 2004); Melani McAlister, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East, 1945–2000* (Berkeley, 2001).

8. One classic formulation is Wilfred Smith's distinction between "belief" and "faith." Smith sought to disabuse contemporaries of the idea that certain beliefs would necessarily elicit certain behaviors—perhaps a more specialized debate among scholars of religion, but one that has methodological relevance for diplomatic historians trying to understand the link between religion and politics. See Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Faith and Belief* (Princeton, 1979), 12.

9. One recent example was provided by the Christian Zionist leader John Hagee. "I often hear pastors, evangelists, and Christians say, 'I really like Israel' or 'I like the Jewish people,'" he wrote. "Jesus couldn't care less what you like or don't like; He's looking for action." John Hagee, *Four Blood Moons: Something Is About to Change* (Brentwood, TN, 2013), 10.

10. Kenneth D. Wald and Allison Calhoun-Brown, *Religion and Politics in the United States* (Lanham, MD, 2014), 200–202.

11. Michelle Mart, *Eye on Israel: How America Came to View the Jewish State as an Ally* (Albany, 2006); Paul S. Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture* (Cambridge, MA, 1994).

12. Peter Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East: U.S. Policy Toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1945–1961* (Chapel Hill, 2004); William B. Quandt, *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict Since 1967*, 3rd. ed. (Washington, DC, 2005).

13. On Truman's religious beliefs about Israel, especially as they crystallized after 1948, see Ronald Radosh and Allis Radosh, *A Safe Haven: Harry S. Truman and the Founding of Israel* (New York, 2009), 344–45.

14. Markku Ruotsila, *The Origins of Christian Anti-Internationalism: Conservative Evangelicals and the League of Nations* (Washington, DC, 2008); Paul Chamberlin, "A World Restored: Religion, Counterrevolution, and the Search for Order in the Middle East," *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 3 (May 2008): 441–69; Caitlin Carenen, *The Ferocious Embrace: Liberal Protestants, Evangelicals, and Israel* (New York, 2012).

15. Matthew Avery Sutton, *American Apocalypse: A History of Modern Evangelicalism* (Cambridge, MA, 2014).

16. Axel R. Schäfer, "The Cold War State and the Resurgence of Evangelicalism: A Study of the Public Funding of Religion Since 1945," *Radical History Review* 2007, no. 99 (September 21, 2007): 19–50.

17. Mark Thomas Edwards, *The Right of the Protestant Left God's Totalitarianism* (New York, 2012).

18. Elesha J. Coffman, *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline* (Oxford, UK, 2013); David A. Hollinger, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in Modern American History* (Princeton, 2013).

19. David T. Courtwright, *No Right Turn: Conservative Politics in a Liberal America* (Cambridge, MA, 2010); Matthew Avery Sutton, "Reagan, Religion, and the Culture Wars of the 1980s," in *A Companion to Ronald Reagan*, ed. Andrew L. Johns (Hoboken, NJ, 2015), 204–20; Melani McAlister, "Prophecy, Politics, and the Popular: The 'Left Behind' Series and Christian Fundamentalism's New World Order," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 773–98.

20. Daniel Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (Oxford, UK, 2010). See also Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York, 2010).

21. Mark Edwards, "The Secularization of American Foreign Policy," Religion in American History blog, June 24, 2014, <http://usreligion.blogspot.com/2014/06/the-secularization-of-american-foreign.html>.