

RELIGION–STATE RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY

This comparative analysis of the constitutional law of religion–state relations in the United States and Germany focuses on the principle of state neutrality. A strong emphasis on state neutrality, a notoriously ambiguous concept, is a shared feature in the constitutional jurisprudence of the US Supreme Court and the German Federal Constitutional Court, but neutrality does not have the same meaning in both systems. In Germany neutrality tends to indicate more distance between church and state, whereas the opposite is the case in the United States. Neutrality also has other meanings in both systems, making straightforward comparison more difficult than it might seem. Although the underlying trajectory of neutrality is different in both countries, the discussion of neutrality breaks down into largely parallel themes. By examining those themes in a comparative perspective, the meaning of state neutrality in religion–state relations can be delineated.

CLAUDIA E. HAUPT teaches as a professorial lecturer in law at George Washington University Law School, Washington, DC. She previously practiced law in Cologne and taught US constitutional history as an adjunct in the Department of Anglo-American History at the University of Cologne.

RELIGION–STATE
RELATIONS IN THE UNITED
STATES AND GERMANY

The Quest for Neutrality

CLAUDIA E. HAUPT



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
 UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
 One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
 314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi - 110025, India
 103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.
 It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of
 education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
 Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107015821

© Claudia E. Haupt 2012

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
 and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
 no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
 permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2012

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data
 Haupt, Claudia E.

Religion-state relations in the United States and Germany :
 the quest for neutrality / Claudia E. Haupt.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-01582-1 (hardback)

1. Religion and state. 2. Religion and state – United States.

3. Religion and state – Germany. I. Title.

BL2015.S72H38 2011

322'.10943–dc23

2011037728

ISBN 978-1-107-01582-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
 accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in
 this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
 or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01582-1 — Religion-State Relations in the United States and Germany
Claudia E. Haupt
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

To
BJH & WFH

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page</i>	x
Introduction		1
PART I The Comparative Approach		9
1 The past and present of comparative constitutional studies		11
1 Historical roots and renewed interest		12
2 Supreme Court controversy		18
3 The academic debate		27
3.1 In favor of comparative constitutional law		28
3.2 Against comparative constitutional law		32
2 The culture wars, American exceptionalism, and a comparative analysis of religion–state relations		40
1 The “culture wars”		42
1.1 Key issues		47
1.2 Judicial activism		50
2 Exceptionalism discourse		53
2.1 Exceptionalism in history, politics, and law		54
2.2 The split identity of exceptionalism		60
3 Situating a comparative analysis of religion–state relations		62
3 Employing a comparative approach		64
1 Issue selection		65
2 Unit of comparison		68

3	Distinguishing outcome and process	71
3.1	Outcome	72
3.2	Process	73
PART II Religion-State Relations and the Role of Neutrality 77		
4	Toward neutrality	79
1	Religion in the classroom	81
1.1	School prayer	82
1.2	Religious symbols	88
1.3	Religious clothing	95
2	Religion in the public square	103
2.1	Religious symbols in courthouses	104
2.2	Prayer and symbols in legislative meetings	109
5	The role of history	113
1	History in German constitutional interpretation	113
2	History in US constitutional interpretation	117
2.1	A brief history of the uses of history	117
2.2	Avoiding “bad history” and providing context	128
6	The roots of neutrality	134
1	Founding discourses	134
1.1	Origins of the US Constitution’s Establishment Clause	136
1.2	Origins of the Basic Law provisions on church and state	143
2	Political and social developments	153
2.1	In the United States	153
2.2	Subsequent political and social developments under the Basic Law	159
7	Delineating neutrality	167
1	Concepts of neutrality	168
1.1	Neutrality as nonconsideration	171
1.2	Substantive or positive neutrality	175
2	Neutrality and separation	178
3	Neutrality and equality	182

CONTENTS

ix

3.1	Equality among religious groups	184	
3.2	Equality between religion and nonreligion	187	
4	Neutrality, civil religion, and ceremonial deism		189
5	Neutrality as an interpretive guide	199	
Conclusion	The future of neutrality in comparative perspective	202	
<i>Index</i>		205	

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is a minimally revised version of my doctoral thesis for which I was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science by the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Cologne.

I sincerely thank my dissertation supervisors at the University of Cologne, Professor Dr. Wolfgang Leidhold and Professor Dr. Norbert Finzsch. Their guidance and suggestions throughout the research and writing process, as well as their administrative skills, were invaluable. For reading and providing insightful comments on portions of the revised manuscript, I thank Richard Albert and David Fontana.

Susan Karamanian, Associate Dean for International and Comparative Legal Studies at the George Washington University Law School, repeatedly made possible what seemingly was not; I cannot thank her enough for her support. Thanks also to Finola O'Sullivan and her team at Cambridge University Press; to my colleagues and friends currently and formerly at the German Historical Institute in Washington, DC, where I conducted substantial parts of the research for this book; to my former colleagues at the Cologne office of Graf von Westphalen; and to my teachers, colleagues, and friends at the George Washington University Law School.

Above all, thanks to my parents; for everything.