Secular Surge

American society is rapidly secularizing – a radical departure from its historically high level of religiosity – and politics is a big part of the reason. Just as, forty years ago, the Religious Right arose as a new political movement, today secularism is gaining traction as a distinct and politically energized identity. This book examines the political causes and political consequences of this secular surge, drawing on a wealth of original data. The authors show that secular identity is in part a reaction to the Religious Right. However, while the political impact of secularism is profound, there may not yet be a Secular Left to counterbalance the Religious Right. Secularism has introduced new tensions within the Democratic Party while adding oxygen to political polarization between Democrats and Republicans. Still, there may be opportunities to reach common ground if politicians seek to forge coalitions that encompass both secular and religious Americans.
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Preface

Students of the politics of personal beliefs – religious and secular – operate in an uncertain time frame. Dramatic changes regularly loom large in the short run, but have little lasting impact, while changes modest in the moment often have consequences years hence. One of your authors (Green) remembers researching the politics of the New Christian Right circa 1980 with colleague James Guth. Guth and Green reminded each other: “we need to work fast because everybody knows these things don’t last.” Forty years later, Christian conservatives are a staple of national politics. Similarly, the New Christian Right was deeply worried about the progressive politics of “secular humanists,” a fear ridiculed by nearly everybody. Forty years on, this book is about the politics of Secularists – humanist and otherwise. Perhaps ironically, our analysis suggests that it is the stridency of the New Christian Right over those forty years that has accelerated the emergence of Secularists as a political force to be reckoned with. While we are no more prescient than anybody else, we suspect that, like the New Christian Right, secular progressives will matter for decades to come.

Many of the details of our analysis, as well as documentation of the survey instruments we have employed, are available in an online appendix. Readers interested in consulting the online appendix will find it at secularsurge.com.
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