

The Pennsylvania State University
The Graduate School
Department of Speech Communication

'God Bless the President': The Rhetoric of Inaugural Prayer

A Thesis in
Speech Communication
by
Martin Jay Medhurst

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
August 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
2. Prelude to Inaugural Prayer	34
3. The Roosevelt Years: A Rhetoric of Social Justice	71
4. The Truman Inaugural: Loyalty, Legitimation, and Paradox	150
5. Dwight D. Eisenhower: The Politics of Faith	201
6. John F. Kennedy: American-Democrat-Catholic	262
7. LBJ: Image, Ego, and the 'Ordination' of Prayer	323
8. The Nixon Years: Inaugural Prayer as Rhetorical Foil	383
9. The Carter Inaugural: A Rhetoric of Confession and Celebration	478
10. The Rhetoric of Inaugural Prayer: A Forty-Year Synopsis	528
APPENDIX A: Examples of the American Mythic Tradition	626
BIBLIOGRAPHY	634

appeared. The occasion was the inauguration of the first President of the United States.

Samuel Provoost: First Inaugural Clergyman

The similarities between the selection of Jacob Duché in 1774 and Samuel Provoost in 1789 are worthy of note. Both men were well-known members of the clergy whose prior reputations brought them to the attention of men in the political sphere. Both were Anglicans who possessed oratorical ability and a commanding presence. More importantly, however, both initiated rhetorical traditions under controversial circumstances. Many scholars agree with Leo Pfeffer when he notes that the "first chaplain of the Continental Congress was selected on the basis of political considerations."⁵⁰ Inaugural prayer seems to have had an equally political birth.

The Debate Over Divine Service

The "new Government" of the United States convened at Federal Hall in New York City in April of 1789. It was not until April 5, however, that Richard Henry Lee arrived from Virginia to form a quorum. Two days after securing a quorum, Congress appointed a committee "to take under consideration the manner of electing chaplains."⁵¹ This is important because it indicates that officially there was no chaplain when the new government gathered under the guidance of the Constitution. Although chaplains had served under the Articles of Confederation, on April 7, 1789, no one officially occupied the position of chaplain to the United States Congress.

A chaplain had not been elected to America's legislative body since 1785 when Reverend Samuel Provoost and Reverend John Rodgers were selected. It was now necessary to settle on a method for selecting a new chaplain. On April 15 the committee composed of Oliver Ellsworth, Richard Henry Lee, Caleb Strong, William Maclay, and Richard Bassett reported,

That two chaplains, of different denominations, be appointed to Congress for the present session, the Senate to appoint one, and give notice thereof to the House of Representatives, who shall, thereupon, appoint the other; which chaplains shall commence their services in the Houses that appoint them, but shall interchange weekly.⁵²

This report was accepted and Saturday, April 25, was designated as the date to elect a chaplain to the Senate. However, between April 15 and 25 other business was being conducted. On April 23, for example, a committee made up of Richard Henry Lee, Ralph Izard, and Tristram Dalton was appointed to work out the details for inaugurating the new President. This committee had apparently received instructions concerning Washington's wishes concerning the ceremony.⁵³ Whether these instructions included any mention of a church service is unclear. It is apparent, however, that Lee's committee decided to include divine service as an official part of the inauguration exercises. What makes this story more interesting, as well as more complex, is that on April 25, Samuel Provoost was elected chaplain to the Senate. Two days later, on April 27, the Senate committee made its recommendations.

On the morning of the 27th Richard Henry Lee's committee submitted the following report:

Resolved. That after the oath shall have been administered to the President, he, attended by the Vice-President, and members of the Senate, and House of Representatives, proceed

to St. Paul's Chapel, to hear divine service, to be performed by the chaplain of Congress already appointed.⁵⁴

This resolution prompted considerable dissent on the Senate floor and led Senator Maclay of Pennsylvania to note in his diary:

Lee offered a motion to the Chair that after the President was sworn . . . the Congress should accompany him to Saint Paul's Church and attend divine service. This had been suggested in Joint Committee. But Lee said expressly that they would not agree to it. I opposed it as an improper business after it had been in the hands of the Joint Committee and rejected, as I thought this a certain method of creating a dissension between the Houses. Izard got up in great wrath and stuttered that the fact was not so. He, however, would say nothing more. I made an effort to rise. The Vice-President hurried the question and it was put and carried by the churchman.⁵⁵

It is unclear whether Maclay meant "churchman," as he wrote, or churchmen. The second choice is the more probable in light of Clarence Bowen's contention that the "question of holding services on the day of the inauguration had been agitated by the clergmen in town."⁵⁶ Yet, the choice of the singular "churchman" is not altogether inconceivable. There was a person in the room whose primary reason for being present was his role as a churchman. The man was Samuel Provoost and he delivered a prayer that very day. According to Maclay, Provoost had opened the session with a prayer before any business had been transacted. Strangely enough, Maclay records a prayer only on the 27th. Maclay's only mention of prayer between April 24 and May 19 was this single instance on the 27th of April.

Bowen also located Provoost in the middle of the controversy over holding services as part of the inauguration:

When Bishop Provoost was applied to on the subject he replied, so Ebenezer Hazard wrote, that the Church of England 'had always been used to look up to Government upon such occasions,' and he thought it prudent not to do anything till they knew what Government would direct.⁵⁷

That the good bishop was as neutral as this quotation would suggest is doubtful. As the immediate past chaplain to Congress and the man just elected the first chaplain under the Constitution, Provoost doubtless realized that the responsibilities for any religious service would fall to him. Such an honor would have placed Bishop Provoost in a position similar to that held by the Archbishop of Canterbury during the English coronation service. Perhaps Hazard was aware of the possibly feigned disinterest when he added, "If the good bishop never prays without an order from Government, it is not probable that the kingdom of heaven will suffer much from his violence."⁵⁸

In spite of Senator Maclay's objections the Senate passed the resolution concerning divine service and sent it to the House for concurrence. On April 29, one day before the inauguration, the House passed the resolution amending it to read:

That after the oath shall have been administered to the President, the Vice-President and members of the Senate, the Speaker and members of the House of Representatives, will accompany him to Saint Paul's Chapel to hear divine service performed by the Chaplains of Congress.⁵⁹

The amendments to the original resolution are particularly enlightening. The House inserted a reference to their leader, the Speaker, to balance the reference to the Vice-President. They also changed "Chaplain" singular to "Chaplains" plural, thus trying to insure that their spiritual representative would be included in the proceedings. By all accounts, he was not.⁶⁰ One of the important points to note, however, is that throughout the debate the issue is not separation of church and state. The issue is the relationship between the two houses of Congress. Even Maclay's disapproval was based on the belief that such a service would cause "dissension between the Houses." There is no indication

that anyone thought it improper to mix the religious and the political realms. This is not surprising since the closest thing to an inauguration with which these men were familiar was the English coronation service.

A Ceremonial Pattern. The ceremonial pattern with which Lee and his committee members were most familiar was the English coronation. The coronation, however, was not really "a civil but an important religious ceremony."⁶¹ Indeed, it was none other than the Archbishop of Canterbury who placed the crown upon the head of George III in 1761. Prayers were an integral part of the coronation service in England.⁶² It was only natural that men who were familiar with English protocol should seek to imitate, at least in part, this most impressive of ceremonials.⁶³

Of course, not everyone in America was enamoured with kingly ceremony or other rituals which smelled of royalty. The well-known debate over the proper title for the new leader demonstrates the strong convictions which this issue engendered. Some congressmen, like Maclay of Pennsylvania, not only objected to bestowing a special title on the leader but also found ceremonies in general objectionable. Maclay recorded his unreserved views on this subject in his diary, "I have had full opportunity of observing the gentlemen of New England," he wrote, "and sorry indeed am I to say it, but no people in the Union dwell more on trivial distinctions and matters of mere form. They really seem to show a readiness to stand on punctillio and ceremony."⁶⁴

Compared to the English coronation of 1761, Washington's first inauguration was anything but ceremonious. On inauguration day a joint committee was appointed to escort the new leader to Federal Hall. But

the committee arrived at Washington's place of residence more than an hour late. While the escort was in route, Chancellor Robert Livingston discovered that there was no Bible on the premises. An aide ran to St. John's Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons to secure a copy of the holy book. When Washington arrived at Federal Hall there was more confusion. No one had planned the last few steps leading up to the administering of the oath. Finally, Washington took matters into his own hands and, along with Samuel Otis and Robert Livingston, stepped out onto the balcony overlooking the crowd.

Washington placed his hand on the Bible and repeated the oath of office:

I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

As the last word still lingered in the air, Washington added spontaneously, "I swear, so help me God." The phrase did not, however, originate with Washington. The new President borrowed this response, it seems, from the English coronation service. Following the administering of the oath to the King, the newly crowned Sovereign would kneel at the altar and place his hands upon the Bible. He would then say: "The things which I have here before promised, I will perform and keep. So help me God."⁶⁵ The Sovereign of England would then kiss the Bible. This was exactly what Washington did following his impromptu exclamation.

Inside St. Paul's Chapel. Following the administering of the oath, Washington walked with the members of the House and Senate to St. Paul's Chapel as the congressional resolution had directed. Inside the church

Bishop Samuel Provoost, Chaplain of the United States Senate, read prayers from the "Proposed" Book of Common Prayer. Whether it is true that Washington listened to the same prayers which he "had heard since his boyhood days in the church at Fredericksburg"⁶⁶ is unclear. The "Proposed" Book had been formulated in 1786 and contained many changes from the English Book of Common Prayer. Several psalms were omitted from the Psalter, "the Benedicite was omitted . . . the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian were entirely omitted; the clause 'He descended into hell' was dropped from the Apostle's Creed,"⁶⁷ and many other significant changes occurred.

Unfortunately, it does not appear that any records of the service or prayers inside of St. Paul's Chapel are now extant. Leicester C. Lewis' work on the history of the Trinity Church parish seems to point to this conclusion. Writing in Lewis' history about the centennial celebration of the first inauguration, Rector Morgan Dix noted:

As to the Order of Divine Service to be used in St. Paul's on the Centennial Day, the general desire was to reproduce, if possible, the very service held in the Chapel one hundred years before. Unfortunately it was found impossible to do this for the lack of information, as no draft of that service could anywhere be found. The newspapers of the period, the archives of the Parish, the minutes of the vestry, were all searched, but without success, nor does it appear that there is anywhere in existence a full account of the services then held, though something of the kind may possibly be found in the files of private letters of the period.⁶⁸

More recent inquiries have also failed to locate the manuscript used by Samuel Provoost when he spoke inside of St. Paul's.⁶⁹

According to Douglas Freeman, "Doctor Provoost did not preach a sermon,"⁷⁰ but simply read from the prayer book. Fisher Ames, who was one of those inside the chapel, later wrote, "I was present in the pew with the President, and must assure you that, after making all deductions

for the delusion of one's fancy in regard to characters, I still think of him with more veneration than for any other person."⁷¹ After singing the Te Deum, Washington entered his carriage and was driven to his residence. A tradition had been born, but its second birthday would not occur until nearly a century and a half later.

50. Leo Pfeffer, Church State and Freedom, rev. ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), p. 248.
51. See Joseph Gales, Senior, compiler, The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, vol I (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1834), p. 18.
52. Gales, The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, vol. I, p. 19.
53. General Washington arrived at Elizabethtown, New Jersey, on the afternoon of April 23. He was immediately escorted into New York City by the Joint Committee and thus had several days in which to make his wishes known to Congress.
54. Gales, The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, vol. I, p. 25.
55. William Maclay, The Journal of William Maclay United States Senator From Pennsylvania, 1789-1791 (New York: Albert and Charles Boni, 1927), p. 4.
56. Clarence Winthrop Bowen, "The Inauguration of Washington," The Century Magazine, 37 (April, 1889), p. 824.
57. Bowen, "The Inauguration of Washington," p. 824.
58. Ebenezer Hazard, quoted in Bowen, "The Inauguration of Washington," p. 824.
59. Gale, The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, vol. I, p. 241.
60. The House did not select a chaplain until May 1--the day after the inauguration. They elected the Reverend William Linn.
61. W. J. Passingham, A History of the Coronation (London: n.d.), p. 18.
62. At the coronation of King George III in 1761 no less than six prayers were read as part of the service. For a detailed description of this service as well as the complete texts of the prayers offered see Richard Thomson, ed., A Faithful Account of the Processions and Ceremonies Observed in the Coronation of the Kings and Queens of England (London: Printed for John Major, 1820), pp. 48-62.
63. For other aspects of the English coronation see B. Wilkinson, The Coronation in History (London: George Philip and Son Ltd., 1953); William Jones, Crowns and Coronations (London: Chatto and Windus, 1883); Lewis Broad, Queens, Crowns and Coronations (London: Hutchinson and Co. Ltd., 1952); Rev. Robert H. Murray,

The King's Crowning (London: John Murray, 1936), and E. C. Ratcliff, The English Coronation Service (London: Skeffington and Son Ltd., 1937).

64. Maclay, Journal, p. 5.
65. See Thomson, ed., A Faithful Account, p. 55.
66. Douglas Southall Freeman, George Washington: Patriot and President, vol. VI (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), pp. 196-197.
67. Francis Procter and Walter Howard Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1911), p. 239. See pages 234-252 for a complete discussion of the evolution of the American Prayer Book. See also Leighton Pullan, The History of the Book of Common Prayer (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), pp. 274-294; G. J. Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1969), pp. 168-212; Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr., The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950).
68. Leicester C. Lewis, ed., A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York, Part V (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), p. 173.
69. These inquiries included letters from the author to the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the General Theological Seminary, and James Thomas Flexner.
70. Freeman, George Washington, p. 197.
71. Seth Ames, ed., Works of Fisher Ames, vol. I (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1854), p. 34.

CHAPTER 3

THE ROOSEVELT YEARS: A RHETORIC OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

The dignitaries inside of St. Paul's Chapel on April 30, 1789, could not have realized that the privilege of hearing prayers at the inauguration of a president would not fall to an American audience for another one hundred and forty-four years. Not until January 20, 1937, was a prayer offered as an official part of the American ceremony of inauguration. At the 1937 inaugural, however, the practice of inaugural prayer was reborn. The circumstances and personalities surrounding its revival and subsequent establishment as a mainstay of the contemporary ceremony of inauguration form the central core of this chapter.

The Senate Tradition

As demonstrated in the last chapter, the intermingling of the religious and the political spheres under the rubric of prayer is not new. Just as Bishop Provoost's role as the first inaugural clergyman grew out of his affiliation with the Continental Congress, so the rebirth of inaugural prayer grew out of the continuing tradition of congressional prayer. From the re-appointment of Jacob Duché in 1776, to the present, prayers have been an abiding component of the congressional day.

Since the Congressional Record only began to record legislative prayers in 1885, a complete record does not exist. However, a sampling

of Senate prayers from the fifty-year period prior to 1937 demonstrates the ongoing nature of the American myths of state. The myths of chosenness, special destiny, mission, sacrifice, death, and rebirth appear repeatedly in the Senate prayers of this period. Even if one confines the sample to prayers delivered in the Senate chambers prior to the swearing in of the new members, one can easily discern the underlying myths.

In the Senate ceremony of 1885 Chaplain E. D. Huntley tapped into the mythic element of America as God's chosen nation when he said:

under the direction of Thy Holy Spirit . . . his [Cleveland's] administration shall prove a signal blessing to this nation and so a blessing to the world.¹

Thus, that which bodes well for America was viewed as necessarily boding well for the rest of the world. This view was quite in keeping with the dominant notion of America's millennial role.²

Four years later in 1889, Senate Chaplain J. G. Butler sounded notes on each part of the mythic scale. He began by recognizing the presence of the Deity at the nation's birth:

We worship Thee, the God of our fathers, our covenant God and Father.³

Not only was the Deity the same one upon whom the fathers called, but He was a power who had covenanted with the American people. Just as God made a covenant with Abraham in Old Testament times, so this God had made a covenant with America.

Butler took cognizance of the sacred documents which the Deity had inspired by praying:

We bless Thee for all the truth and righteousness embodied in the Constitution and laws of this Republic. We thank Thee for the faith of the fathers and for the faith and piety and patriotism and wisdom of their sons.

Hence, the Chaplain drew attention to the inherent sacredness of the American philosophy of government. This philosophy was sacred for it contained the truths of God who, in his mercy, had revealed them to the fathers of the Republic. The fathers, as faithful servants of the Deity, responded with "piety and patriotism," the terms being virtually interchangeable.

Butler returned to the theme of an unbroken covenant when he said:

We bless Thee for the rich heritage of freedom coming to us,
and we thank Thee, O God, that in all our history Thou hast
guided and defended us.

Again, the deity had been faithful to his covenant. The Chaplain explicitly played the chord of chosenness by praying:

Bless the great people of this land Emanuel's land.

Implicit in this request was the assumption that the interests of the American people were the same as the interests of the Deity. Hence, by realizing their own interests, the people would truly be making their land Emanuel's land. In this process America would become a beacon light to all the nations of the world. As Butler said:

Among the nations of the earth Thou has exalted us. Make us
a pattern nation, O God, and let Thy blessing rest upon
these Thy servants.

In 1893 Butler again offered a prayer in the Senate chambers in which he recognized the hand of God in the creation of the nation.

We bring to Thee our heart homage, God of our fathers,
thanking Thee for our rich heritage of faith and of
freedom, hallowed by the toils and tears, the valor
and blood and prayers, of our patriot dead.⁴

To the Chaplain, faith and freedom were inextricably linked together. The faith in the Deity produced the freedom, or so the Chaplain seemed to imply. The patriot dead sent up prayers so Butler, likewise,

petitioned the Deity that "in the future, as in the past, the unseen hand may lead us."

Butler left little doubt that the millennial kingdom was to be ushered in through the American nation: "Bless all the people of this great nation," he prayed, "prospering every right endeavor . . . and bringing in the reign of peace and righteousness more and more." America was God's instrument and through this instrument the Deity would effect righteousness on earth. The beginning of this heaven on earth extended back to the birth of the nation.

For Chaplain Edward E. Hale, America was God's new Israel. In his Senate prayer of 1905 Hale quoted from scripture:

I will multiply my people, they shall not be few. I will glorify them, and they shall not be small . . . and ye shall be my people and I will be your God. . . . Be not afraid, neither be discouraged. For the Lord Thy God is with thee withersoever thou goest.⁵

This was a succinct statement of the perceived relationship between God and America. If there was any doubt about the nature of this relationship, Hale eliminated it in 1909 when he said:

Thou has been pleased to make this people Thine own nation.⁶

Thus, from its beginning, America was a nation set apart, a country chosen for a purpose, a people sacred and true.

What evolved in America was the work of God. As Chaplain Forrest Prettyman noted in 1917:

Thou hast given us a vision of a fair and beautiful form of civilization.⁷

It was this divine vision which had guided the leaders of the nation and that helped them to become God's representatives here on earth. Just as

the Deity called the world into existence by the power of his Word, so he spoke the words that created America. As ZeBarney Phillips noted in his Senate prayer of 1929:

Thou has called us by our name and we are Thine. Thou has established us in the gateways of the world. Thou hast moulded our speech, mixed our blood from uncorrupted springs and crowned us with every blessing; make us therefore a righteous nation.⁸

One finds in every inaugural prayer offered in the Senate chambers prior to the inauguration of the president explicit statements dealing with the myth of the creation, the relationship of the Deity to the creative act, and the sacred character of America as a chosen nation which has covenanted with an eternal God. Such mythic statements were in keeping with the social position of the persons doing the praying. As members of the dominant religious group--Protestant clergymen--these pray-ers could sing the praises of the Deity and recite the cosmogonic myth with little hesitation.⁹ In addition, their audience was limited to those elite few who could gather within the Senate chambers, the majority of whom were of Protestant orientation.

Repetition of the mythic themes invited the listeners to think of their nation in sacred terms. As the nation's sacred character increased, the religions spawned by the nation also became more sacred and secure through their identification with the national ethos. By testifying to the endorsement of the nation by God, the pray-ers were also testifying to the legitimacy of their position within the American religious structure.¹⁰ In 1937, however, a marked change occurred. Not only was inaugural prayer reborn, but it was reborn in the wake of religious and political turmoil. In the midst of this turmoil one found not only a

Protestant chaplain, but also a Roman Catholic priest. One also found a president who understood the rhetorical character of ceremony and who recognized the influence of religious authority. It was in this context that contemporary inaugural prayers were instituted by fiat on January 20, 1937.

Transforming Traditions

The inaugural ceremony of 1937 was a pacesetter in several respects. First, it marked the first time in the twentieth century that the Vice-President had taken the oath of office on the same platform and in the same ceremony with the President. The usual procedure until 1937 was to administer the oath of office to the Vice-President-Elect at the close of the regular legislative session. This allowed the Vice-President-Elect to act in his role as President of the Senate and thus to preside over the Senate on inauguration day. Since he was already sworn in he would simply read his address to the Senators and then preside over the swearing in of the Senators-Elect. All of these activities took place within the Senate chambers and thus out of the sight of the general public.

When the Senate had concluded its business it would usually move to the east portico of the Capitol where the inauguration of the President would take place. From 1793-1933 there were no prayers delivered at the presidential inauguration per se. The only prayer was that delivered by the Senate chaplain in accordance with normal operating procedures. In 1937, however, a new twist was added. Not only did the Vice-President-Elect join the President-Elect on the

inaugural platform, but the chaplain of the Senate also appeared on the platform to open with prayer. Hence, a practice which had originated in Congress was transplanted to the inaugural ceremony. This shift of venue is significant for it set a precedent for all future inaugurals. Whereas the chaplain's prayer was originally directed to the Senators, it now became directed to all attending the inaugural ceremonies as well as those listening or viewing via the media.

The transplanting of the chaplain was not the only significant change that occurred in 1937. In addition to placing the chaplain in the public arena, Roosevelt introduced the first non-chaplain pray-er. Not only was the second pray-er a non-chaplain, but he was a non-Protestant as well. This marked the first time in inaugural history that anyone other than a Protestant clergyman had delivered an inaugural prayer.¹¹ The pacesetter in this regard was the Right Reverend John A. Ryan of Catholic University in Washington, D. C. Ryan became the first Catholic to pray at an inaugural ceremony and at the same time acquired the distinction of being the first person to deliver an inaugural benediction. Until 1937 there was no benediction pronounced over the ceremonies. A close examination of the presidential addresses from 1793-1933 reveals that the newly elected leader often provided his own benediction in the last few lines of his address. In 1933, for example, Roosevelt ended his address:

In this dedication of a Nation we humbly ask the blessing of God. May He protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in the days to come.¹²

One might think that by introducing a clergyman to deliver a benediction the mini-benediction would gradually drop out of the

inaugural address. Such has not been the case. Clifford Owsley notes that "with only one exception, every President invoked the blessings of God on his administration and the country in the terminal of his inaugural address, or in one of them if he delivered more than one. Theodore Roosevelt, who made only one inaugural address, did not follow the tradition."¹³

If the benediction did not affect the inaugural address, one might reasonably ask why it was included at all. Indeed, why was there a benediction in 1937 when there had never been one in the entire history of presidential inaugurations? To answer this question one must return to the days prior to Roosevelt's ascent to the presidency. One must return to the sources from which Roosevelt's rhetorical use of religion grew. As we shall see, the rebirth of inaugural prayer was but one manifestation of a much larger pattern involving Roosevelt's conception of the relationship between religion and government.

Roosevelt and Religion--The Beginnings. Franklin Roosevelt was particularly qualified to be president of a country where over 95 percent of the population claimed to believe in a Supreme Being, for Roosevelt was, himself, a believer. Raised by a mother of unitarian leaning and a father dedicated to episcopalianism, the young Franklin learned love of God and Church at a tender age. A communicant at St. James Episcopal Church in his native Hyde Park, Franklin Roosevelt never lost the belief of his youth.

Roosevelt's belief was strengthened at Groton, a private prep school in Massachusetts, where the future president came under the influence of the Reverend Endicott Peabody, an influence that would

NOTES

1. E. D. Huntley, quoted in Congressional Record--Senate (1885), p. 1.
2. For more detail on the dominant conceptions of America's millennial role and mission see Ernest Lee Tuveson, Redeemer Nation: The Idea of America's Millennial Role (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); H. Richard Niebuhr, The Kingdom of God in America (New York: Harper Brothers, 1937); Sacvan Bercovitch, The Puritan Origins of the American Self (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975); Perry Miller, The Life of the Mind in America from the Revolution to the Civil War (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965); Sherwood Eddy, The Kingdom of God and the American Dream (New York: Harper and Row, 1941); Darroll M. Bryant, "America as God's Kingdom," in Jurgen Moltmann, et al., eds., Religion and Political Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); and J. F. Maclear, "The Republic and the Millenium," in Elwyn A. Smith, ed., Religion of the Republic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 183-216.
3. J. G. Butler, quoted in Congressional Record--Senate, 51st Congress (1889), p. 1.
4. J. C. Butler, quoted in Congressional Record--Senate, 53rd Congress (1893), p. 1.
5. Edward E. Hale, quoted in Congressional Record--Senate, 59th Congress (1905), p. 1.
6. Edward E. Hale, quoted in Congressional Record--Senate, 61st Congress (1909), p. 1.
7. Forrest J. Prettyman, quoted in Congressional Record--Senate, 65th Congress (1917), p. 1.
8. ZeBarney T. Phillips, quoted in Congressional Record--Senate, 71st Congress (1929), p. 3.
9. Conrad Cherry notes that "during the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, leading spokesmen for the civil religion couched its beliefs in terms that were unmistakeably Protestant. Sacred ceremonies celebrated the hope for the spread of an 'American Christian civilization,' a Christian civilization that was inclusive enough to embrace the diverse Protestant denominations but seldom large enough to include Roman Catholics." See Conrad C. Cherry, "American Sacred Ceremonies," in Phillip E. Hammond and Benton Johnson, eds., American Mosaic: Social Patterns of Religion in the United States (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 311.

10. The relationship between the "official" pray-ers and the political status quo is a dialectical one. As Berger and Luckmann note: "In other words, conservative political forces tend to support the monopolistic claims of the universal experts, whose monopolistic organizations in turn tend to be politically conservative. Historically, of course, most of these monopolies have been religious. It is thus possible to say that churches, understood as monopolistic combinations of full-time experts in a religious definition of reality, are inherently conservative once they have succeeded in establishing their monopoly in a given society. Conversely, ruling groups with a stake in the maintenance of the political status quo are inherently churchly in their religious orientation and, by the same token, suspicious of all innovations in the religious tradition." See Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), p. 123.
11. Ostensibly there had been Senate prayers by non-Protestants. The first and only Catholic to serve as Chaplain of the United States Senate was Constantine Pise in 1832.
12. Franklin D. Roosevelt, "First Inaugural Address," March 4, 1933, in Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 239. All quotations from inaugural addresses are from this source.
13. Clifford D. Owsley, Inaugural (New York: Olympic Press, 1964), p. 14.
14. Paul K. Conkin, The New Deal (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1967), p. 9.
15. Conkin, p. 9.
16. Alfred B. Rollins, Jr., "Young F. D. R. and the Moral Crusaders," New York History, 37 (1956), 4.
17. Rollins, p. 14.
18. Thomas H. Greer, What Roosevelt Thought: The Social and Political Ideas of Franklin D. Roosevelt (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1958), p. 6.
19. James A. Farley, Behind the Ballots--The Personal History of a Politician (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1938), p. 208.
20. Roosevelt, quoted in William E. Leuchtenburg, Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal 1932-1940 (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 8.
21. Sidney E. Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), p. 920.