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Abstract

Senator Inhofe (R-OK) threw a snowball on the Senate floor because he believed global warming did not exist. The reason it does not exist according to Senator Inhofe is because the holy scriptures says so. Religious rhetoric in the contemporary Senate is uncharted territory. In the pages below, you will find out about the 112th Congress. Specifically, you will find out who and how senators used religious rhetoric. You see an analysis based off of previous analyses of presidential rhetoric. A comprehensive view of the 112th Congress and how that view used religious rhetoric through text analysis of all senate speeches. The findings are found below through an additional analysis of means and regressions.
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Religious Rhetoric in the Contemporary Senate

“I ask the chair; you know what this is? It’s a snowball, just from outside here. So it’s very, very cold out. Very unseasonal. Mr. President, catch this.”
- Senator James Inhofe, Senate Floor, 2/26/2015

Introduction

On February 26, 2015, Senator James Inhofe threw a snowball in the Senate. Yes, a literal snowball he made during a snowstorm. He pulled it out of a Ziploc bag and by tossing it to Republican Senator Bill Cassidy, who was presiding over the Senate, he was making a statement. The Oklahoma Republican, suspicious of the global warming argument, with snowball in hand declared:

They talk about climate from the beginning of time has changed and changed both ways. They talk about it, scriptures talk about it. And, so this is something that everyone has agreed and no one would debate that it has always happened. The debate is whether man is causing that to happen.

He made the same argument in his book, The Greatest Hoax: How the Global Warming Conspiracy Threatens Your Future, in which, he states: “The hoax doesn’t concern the existence of climate change – for which, there is archeological, biblical, and historical evidence.” Instead he argues, humans simply can’t change climate. He gives commentary on how scripture, specifically Genesis 8:22, relates to the climate change argument:

Well actually the Genesis 8:22 that I use in there is that ‘as long as the earth remains there will be seed time and harvest, cold and heat, winter and summer, day and night,’ my point, is God’s still up there. The arrogance of people to think

---

2 It is bolded for the purpose of showing the religious specific rhetoric and for accentuating purposes.
that we, human beings, would be able to change what He is doing in the climate is to me outrageous.  

His problem with climate change stems from the theory that human intervention with CO₂ gases has affected the environment. Instead, he believes God is in control of the environment and humans are not powerful enough to refute God or His scripture. Ergo, he delivered his dramatic speech – complete with prop. His religious affiliation and beliefs dictated his actions and words when used on the Senate floor. The snowball was an illustration to compare how despite 2014 being the “hottest” year on record, it was extremely cold on that February day. While his actions were deemed crazy by some news outlet. They were a bigger illustration of religious reasoning and rhetoric behind policy debates and discourse.

Senator Inhofe demonstrates how religious affiliation and rhetoric are used during policy debates. My study of this relationship between religious rhetoric and politics shines light on the legislative process. Senator Inhofe is one of the most conservative senators currently serving and my hypothesis will test to see if more polarized senators use more religious rhetoric more than less polarized senators.

---

Chapter 1: Understanding Religious Rhetoric

Purposeful Rhetoric

Rhetoric and the Senate go hand in hand. Senators use rhetoric in campaigning, persuading, and negotiating. These examples are only a small sample of when senators use rhetoric. The rhetoric is purposeful when used as well. Everything is said for a reason. Sometimes, a senator may talk without thinking, but a majority of the time senators speak with purpose. The purpose provides motive for why senators talk like they do.

Three primary factors can explain a senator’s rhetoric. The first set of factors are contextual factors, which include where they are from and how old they are. These factors are also based on the surroundings in which the senator is in when they get elected. The second set of factors are political, which includes party affiliation and how liberal or conservative the senators are, because rhetoric can influence the political image from the party and ideological sects. The last set is personal factors, which includes religious affiliation, profession, gender, and race. These three sets provide insight into how each politician is an individual and how these factors influence the way they talk to each another on the Senate floor.

Rhetoric, whether implicit or explicit in intent, has a purpose. In a mournful time, 9 days following the events of 9-11, President George W. Bush gave an address to a joint session of Congress and to the American people. Keeping with a somber mood of the country, he requested
prayers for those affected by the tragedies of the events. In addition, toward the end of the speech he uses religious rhetoric to show God is on America’s side:5

The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them.

Fellow citizens, we’ll meet violence with patient justice-assured of the rightness of our cause, and confident of the victories to come. In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States of America.6

In all, Bush makes three references to “God” and uses the religious statements within to give confidence to that the American people will prevail. By arguing that God is not neutral on freedom and justice, Bush begs the question of which side God is really on. As most religious extremist groups believe the same thing when they carry out their activities. Therefore, it is almost as if Bush is using this statement to make us as the public to believe God is on our side. The side seems to be arbitrary, dependent on what side is more likable and who needs to use the rhetoric to begin with. In addition, he asks God to grant us wisdom and to watch over us, as he most certainly will give us victory over the enemy. He attempts to persuade the American people with the help of religious rhetoric to go to war against terrorism. The prayerful rhetoric he uses in the speech provides us with specific evidence of the type of rhetorical persuasion he is using.

To conclude, three primary factors explain why individual senators use this rhetoric. In addition, politicians use the rhetoric to give persuasive arguments for a preference based off of these factors. The example of how President George W. Bush used religious rhetoric to convince


6 Reference to God are underlined for the purpose of showing the religious specific rhetoric and for accentuating purposes.
the American people to go to war against terrorism was purposeful in use and religious communication was present.

**Literature Review**

Robert Bellah assesses how President John F. Kennedy uses “God” is his inauguration speech he gave on January 20, 1961:

We observe today not a victory of party but a celebration of freedom--symbolizing an end as well as a beginning--signifying renewal as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forbears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe--the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God. …

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God’s work must truly be our own.⁷

Bellah explains the implications in using the word “God” on voters. Kennedy’s speech, while not long, made three references to God. He uses it twice at the beginning of his speech and once at the end. JFK wasn’t the first or last president to invoke the use of God in his inauguration speech.⁸ He was the most notable because he was the first Catholic president and some people were worried about the pope having ultimate authority over the president. Bellah provides a good

---


generalization on how state and politics realistically interact with each other to better understand the implications of JFK’s invocation of God:

> “Considering the separation of church and state, how is a president justified in using the word "God" at all? The answer is that the separation of church and state has not denied the political realm a religious dimension. Although matters of personal religious belief, worship, and association are considered to be strictly private affairs, there are, at the same time, certain common elements of religious orientation that the great majority of Americans share. These have played a crucial role in the development of American institutions and still provide a religious dimension for the whole fabric of American life, including the political sphere. This public religious dimension is expressed in a set of beliefs, symbols, and rituals that I am calling American civil religion. The inauguration of a president is an important ceremonial event in this religion.”

Bellah explains the nature of how religion is almost a necessary condition to the political realm because of the influence it can have on individual politicians. It opens the floodgates for religious rhetoric to influence policy. Most rhetoric and political language is designed and intended to influence policy. In looking at Kennedy, Bellah uses the idea of American civil religion. He points out specifically the religious dimension and how it is a central point in a person’s life. How does and should civil religion play in politics beyond the obvious? In all, civil religion has an effect on a person’s life and I believe politicians like Kennedy and Bush have used this to influence policy.

Domke and Coe, in “The God Strategy”, take the idea of civil religion in politics a step further. They do an in-depth analysis of religious rhetoric throughout the presidential inaugural addresses and the party platforms since 1932. Domke and Coe claim past presidents have used this “The God Strategy” as a partisan weapon to motivate their religious constituents to

---

participate in politics.\textsuperscript{10} They document an especially large increase in presidential religious rhetoric at the beginning of the Reagan revolution in 1980:

> Since World War I, every incoming president has made the God reference." If you look at the world wars, both of them, and how religious language was used, it's pretty incredible how effective both [Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt] used religious imagery to swing public opinion from an otherwise deeply entrenched reluctance to enter into war into an almost crusade mentality among many people,” Both of Obama's inaugural speeches mentioned God the same number of times — five, more than either of predecessor George W. Bush's two inaugural speeches (three times each). Ronald Reagan's second inaugural holds the record, with eight references, while Richard Nixon mentioned God six times in his first inaugural in 1969. \textsuperscript{11}

Reagan holds the record for using “God” in his inauguration speech at 8 times. The unique ability of Reagan being able to unify the Republican Party was in part because of “The God Strategy.” Before the Reagan Revolution, the Christian Right was not particularly involved in politics until the New Christian Right movement consolidated under him, which, in part, explains why he overwhelmingly won the 1984 presidential election.\textsuperscript{12} The presidents coming after Reagan have used more religious rhetoric to appeal to religious voters according to Domke and Coe. The finding by Domke and Coe is useful because it describes how the political climate is shifting and politicians are using religious rhetoric more then they have before. Specifically, it is useful in giving insight in to how the Senate has been acting in the 112\textsuperscript{th} Congress.

Domke and Coe find that Republican and Democratic presidents use about the same amount of religious rhetoric. In previous work I have shown that the same is true for the modern Senate as well. Senators of both parties use religious rhetoric at the same rate. Interestingly, however, Republicans seem to hold a lead over Democrats among religious voters.

Figure 1: Trend in Party Identification by Religion
Since Ronald Reagan brought religious voters in droves to it, the Republican Party has taken increasingly religious stances on a variety of issues. Correspondingly, the Democratic Party has become increasingly secular, especially on social issues. Nonetheless, the Democratic Party does contain a prominent religious left, especially on issues like income inequality and the death penalty.

Throughout Domke and Coe’s book they try to see if the “God Strategy” is party specific. Their findings reveal, in fact, that both parties use religious rhetoric at the presidential level and
there is no statistically significant difference between the Republican and Democrats. In my preliminary analysis last year of the 113th Congress, the same can be said for the Senate, as there was no statistical significant finding between the parties. Even though ideology within the party had an effect, no difference across the party lines existed.

Presidential rhetoric outside of the inauguration speeches, rhetoric can be classified in three categories: ceremonial rhetoric, instrumental rhetoric, and comforting and calming rhetoric. The classifications provide distinct categories separating religious rhetoric dependent upon its purpose. Ceremonial rhetoric is used in speeches like holiday addresses, funeral eulogies, and honorary speeches. Comforting and calming rhetoric is used after the reporting of heinous crimes to help comfort the public. Instrumental rhetoric is the religious rhetoric used when arguments founded on religious concepts or beliefs are used to help sway a specific goal, such as passing legislation or influencing party. These categorizations are useful tools to help distinguish presidential rhetoric and are useful in senate rhetoric as well. While the senators don’t use calm and comfort as much as the president, the instrumental and ceremonial rhetoric should be similar if not more so among senators.

Before performing the data analysis, I justify my examination of Senate floor speeches. In the previous literature, political scientists have studied presidential rhetoric, but working with the Senate provides more text to study because of the larger sample size in the Senate. At first glance it may look like the floor is a holy place of prepared speeches, as most senators seem to be reading a speech rather than having actual impromptu discourse. On-the-fly discourse may give more insight to the speaker’s daily vernacular, but a prepared speech is more purposeful

---

than on-the-fly discourse because thought goes into what the speaker wants to convey. Floor speeches are the perfect samples to study because it provides the most purposeful rhetoric.

Rhetoric used on the floor is not as emotionally charged as a campaign speech, but it does portray what the senator wants his or her constituents to hear. The Senate staffer or possibly the senator themselves prepares the speech they are going to give. They have time to practice or proofread what they are going to say. What they say is based on who they are. Examining the characteristics that affect a senator’s rhetoric gives greater insight into the contemporary senate and who uses it.

Something that has been done well throughout much of the literature is a comprehensive look into presidential rhetoric. Bellah is very good at examining the contextual background of the relationship between church and state. Domke and Coe provide reasons why a president’s rhetoric may occur with the God Strategy creating momentum in religious voters. Finally, O’Connell gives a categorization of rhetoric that helps pinpoint it for specific purposes. The foundation laid in the study of presidential rhetoric is pivotal in starting congressional research.

Chapter 2: Understanding the Senate
Although scholars have examined presidential religious rhetoric in detail, they have not studied senatorial rhetoric. The difference between presidential rhetoric and senatorial rhetoric is when looking at the President you have to look at one individual, whereas with the Senate, 100 different individuals are comprising the Senate rhetoric. In the end, the individual determines how much religious rhetoric they want to use at any given time. Therefore, my project takes a comprehensive look into the Senate from the 112th Congress. It will build upon the previous presidential rhetoric and history to study the Senate. In the previous literature, party was the main identifier to study between Presidents. I want to build upon these studies by examining multiple senator characteristics to help compose an understanding of senatorial religious rhetoric. These characteristics include party, religious grouping, polarization, age, gender, race, and profession. While not exhaustive, these characteristics provide a starting point to understanding why and how the Senate uses religious rhetoric.

Most politicians identify a religious affiliation. In the 112th Congress, 37 percent of senators were Mainline Protestant, 24% Catholic, 14% Evangelical Protestant, 13% Jewish, and 12% other affiliation. It is important to distinguish the Protestant faith because mainline and evangelical are so different from each other. Specifically, Evangelical Protestant’s focus more on evangelism toward non-believers as opposed to Mainline Protestants. The other affiliation category is composed of faiths not able to be categorized with the others.

The parties are different in their religious affiliation. The biggest discrepancy in the parties is that no Jewish Republicans are present in the 112th Congress. The Democrats, as you can see in table 1, are relatively equal among Catholic, Mainline Protestant, and Jewish Senators.

---

However, the Republicans are not equal in regards to religious affiliation. Mainline Protestant dominates the Republican party with 48% of all Republicans and 20% more than the Democrats have. The breakdown below shows the percentages within the party of what religion they identify with. The difference shows the difference between the party by percentage.

Table 1: 112th Congress Religious Affiliation by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religions Affiliation by Party</th>
<th>Republicans N=48</th>
<th>Democrats N=53</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a whole, the 112th Congress is mostly Protestant. A possible reason for such a large percentage is because it is not too far in the religious landscape of the United States. According to the religious landscape survey by Pew, 31.9% of Americans are Mainline Protestant, 14.7% are Mainline Protestant, 20.8% are Catholic, 1.9% Jewish, 1.6% Mormon, and 22.8% unaffiliated.\(^{15}\)

The biggest discrepancy is the Other, Jewish, and Mainline Protestant categories. The table below compares all Senators to the religious landscape study to get an idea how representative the 112th Congress is to the constituents they represent.

---

Table 2: 112th Congress Religious Affiliation vs. Public Religious Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senators N=101</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All but one president in the last 100 years has been Protestant. The one Catholic, JFK, served more than 50 years ago. The presidential research into religious rhetoric has only begun the potential to be found in this area of study and it seems the Senate is a start in the right direction. The comparison of religious rhetoric with religious affiliation and other characteristics provide new avenues to study religious rhetoric.

The political factors ill be looking at are outlined below. First I look at is the extremism scores from the DW-Nominate score and party affiliation of the Senators. through looking at the DW- Nominate scores it helps take into effect really conservative and really liberal senators. I expect more conservative senators will use more religious rhetoric. They are categorized on a scale of -1 (liberal) to 1 (conservative). I also look at party affiliation as well. This helps not only do an analysis between the parties, but also within each party. In the 112th, the Democrats controlled the Senate 52-48 over the Republicans.

The Republican Senators of the 112th Congress are significantly more polarized then the Democrat Senators. As pointed out in the figure below, you can see a major discrepancy between Republicans and Democrats in how polarized their views towards conservatism and liberalism.
Bernie Sanders (D-VT) is the most liberal Senator at a -.523 DW-Nominate score, and Mike Lee (R-UT) is the most conservative Senator at .986 DW-Nominate score.

Figure 2: Republican DW-Nominate Scores
The majority of the project will focus on the religiosity rhetoric ratio and the comparison to each DW-nominate score, party, and religious affiliation. The rest of the groupings compare multiple other characteristics to try and isolate the effect of the religious words per 1000 on the major variables. The other characteristics I will comb through will be the following:

- The age variable is split into 5 different categories as seen below in the table. Age and religiosity have had a relationship in the general public as religiosity increases with age on average. In the 112th Congress, the average age of all the Senators was 66 at the end of their term in the 112th. As you can see by the table below, the Democrats are on average older then the Republicans. Democrats not only have more Senators in the 70-79

category; they also have the only Senators in the 80 and above category, whereas the Republicans have none.

Table 3: 112th Congress Age by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>112th Age by Party</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican (N=48)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat (N=53)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gender- looking into whether male or female, gives insight as to try and separate if more religious rhetoric is used dependent on gender. In the 112th, there were only 17 women serving. As you can see in the table below, there is a large discrepancy between women and men as a whole and an even larger discrepancy between the Republican ratio of men and women.

Table 4: 112th Congress Gender by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>112th Gender by Party</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican N = 48</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat N = 53</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The race variable helps to see if there is a difference in race and religiosity and see the difference and how they play into account with the results from the religiosity ratio. Race will help eliminate any racial differences between religions. The 112th Congress is not very diverse in race. Most of the Senators are white and only 4 senators are of other
races. The four non-white senators are Senator Akaka (D-HI), Senator Inouye (D-HI), Senator Menendez (D-NJ), and Senator Rubio (R-FL).

- The profession variable may affect the type of rhetoric they use. There seems to be a difference in religiosity when profession and gender are looked at together.\textsuperscript{17} In the table below, the professions of the 112\textsuperscript{th} Congress are broken down by party. Lawyers are the most obvious the winners of the most Senators by profession. The Politician category refers to people who may have had a law degree, but never actually practiced law and instead were career politicians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>112th Profession by Party</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Lawyer</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Politician</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems like the opportune time to see if religion or religious talk has been used because of the big issues being discussed and the presence of the God Strategy. The increase in party polarization in senatorial politics is almost a sure fact, and because of this increase, rhetoric most certainly also changed to accommodate. This analysis posits my research question: What does religious Rhetoric look like on the Senate floor? And my Hypothesis to test this question is: Ideological Senators use more instrumental religious rhetoric than less ideological Senators. The ideology will be determined from DW-Nominate in terms of how conservative or how liberal a

senator is. The implications of doing this research will see the religious effect on Congress and the hypothesis is a subject test to see how and if this affects the Senate. We already know from previous research that presidential rhetoric is instrumentally motivated. So the goal is to see if the same is true for the Senate.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The methodological approach for the project is a study of religious rhetoric through text analysis of all Senate speeches in the 112th Congress. The data that I use is Senate speech data of everything said on the Senate floor. This data is available on congress.gov and the Government Publishing Office (GPO) transcribes all Senate speeches. The data I collected was then separated by senator. The speeches were scraped from the GPO by a computer coding scheme and placed into excel documents. Each excel file (one senator is represented per excel file) was counted for religious words based off a comprehensive list of words hypothesized to be spoken on the floor. (explain the transition to the variable)

The variable of religious words per 1000 (words) was created by dividing the number of religious words spoken by each senator by the total number of words they spoke multiplied by 1000. This ratio is small comparatively, but the religious words are only a snippet of what could be a religious speech and its effects. This is the best way to evaluate the senators as some may speak more or less and senators who talk more are likely to say more religious words. It is also an approach used by past authors in examining presidential rhetoric to determine religiosity.

I analyzed the text and developed the religiosity variable by using key religious words that would be affiliated with religions, like Jesus, God, Islam, Christianity, etc. The word bank I compiled is based on the previous research into religious rhetoric especially from political scientists like Domke & Coe and O’Connell. The full word bank is found in the appendix and allowed me to look across many different words and see if certain words are used more than others by certain senators. For example, I would assume Jewish senators would use more Jewish-related rhetoric than Christian rhetoric and so on. To give an idea of the popular words I looked
into, I have attached a word cloud of certain religious words used in my analysis to illustrate which were used most.

Figure 4: Religious Word Cloud
If you refer to the word cloud, the size of the word corresponds to the number of times the word was used. The larger the word, the more times it was used. Faith, Church, and Spirit are the most used words on the Senate floor. Faith and Spirit are more frequent because of the non-religious context in which the words can be used. They are still religious words regardless of context because of the connotations of the words. Faith means complete trust or confidence in something. The original context means a trust or confidence one would only have in God. So it is a strong religious word used to show trust in something. Spirit means those qualities regarded as forming the definitive or typical elements in the character of a person, nation, or group or in the thought and attitudes of a particular period. Once again the original context refers to the elements of something, and specifically the spirit is supposed to be the element of our body. The word still has a secondary religious connotation even though its primary one may be non-religious.

The analysis of the Senate provided 33,330 data points. The data points came from the 101 senators (including 1 special election senator) and separating the 110 words into three categories corresponding to the type of speech. The three categories are policy, tribute, and random speeches. Policy speeches are those referring to policy in the speech. Tribute speeches are those referring to honoring a person or paying tribute to a constituent. Finally, the random speeches are the catch-all category, referring to those unable to be categorized between the policy and tribute categories, such as procedural speeches. Overall, the categories analyzed were mostly the policy and tribute speeches. The random speeches provided only a small amount of the overall rhetoric with an average of only 5% of total religious rhetoric being categorized in the random category.

When looking back at O’Connell’s categorizations of rhetoric, it is useful to view them alongside policy and tribute speeches. The categorizations of instrumental, ceremonial, and calm
and comforting rhetoric are present in Congress. Policy and instrumental rhetoric are related because most policy speeches utilize instrumental rhetoric. Ceremonial and calm, comforting rhetoric are a part of tribute speech because in a lot of tribute speeches the senators honor or consult others.

On the Senate floor, they celebrate everything from major holidays to senators’ birthdays. However, they also talk about big issues. During the 112th Congress and the years following, we saw the rise of the gun control question following multiple mass shootings. We saw the government shut down because of an unwillingness to cooperate across the aisle. Overall, the use of instrumental rhetoric in policy speeches is important because of the issues present during the 112th Congress.

In addition to applying categories, the 101 senators in the 112th Congress (including the senator elected in special elections) and the 110 words in the word bank produced the data points for the analysis. All of the data are organized per senator in different excel files. The analysis did a word count for each file and a computer program in Python produced the counts for each word used per type of speech. The computer program was a necessary method as an individual count per file per word would be certainly less efficient. The next step includes doing more individualized analysis to see why certain words are used more in certain categories. This allowed me to look more into the specific context in which the words were used to try and find uses of instrumental rhetoric by specific senators.

The religious word counts are processed and analyzed by dividing each specific word by the total number of words each senator spoke on the Senate floor. The number created is then multiplied by 1000 to develop the number of religious words out of every 1000 words spoken. The number is representative of religiosity because it explains how much each senator talks
about religion on the Senate floor. The idea is that the more words each senator uses per 1000 total words, the more religious they are outside of the Senate because they bring their religiosity into the Senate with them.

I use the religious words per 1000 measure as the dependent variable of the analysis. I compare it against multiple groupings of the senators. The groupings act as independent variables to help try to isolate groupings using more religious rhetoric to see the instrumental impact they have in the policy and tribute speeches. The benefit of evaluating the groupings this way is to eliminate outside factors to make the religious words per 1000 a reflective input on how religious a senator may be.

The independent variables were collected for each senator to prepare for the cross analysis with the dependent variable. The age, profession, religious affiliation, gender, and race of the senators were all collected. The characteristics are all compared with the religious words per 1000 to determine if any of the groupings have a mean outside of the normal distribution of the total mean of all the senators. In addition, a regression analysis provided the relationship between DW-Nominate scores and the religious words per 1000 measure. It was useful to see if the two were related to each other in the 112th Congress. The mean comparison helps isolate the relationship between DW-Nominate and religious words per 1000 measure in the case that one grouping skewed the relationship.

In the following chapters, I discuss the findings and conclusions of the research. First, I provide case studies of religiously charged speeches by specific senators of the 112th Congress. Then I give insight to the specific words senators say on the Senate floor. Finally, I reveal the religious words per 1000 measure alongside the grouping of means analysis and regression analysis with the polarization scores. Either way, the results will provide an interesting insight
into how partisanship influences religious rhetoric. Even if the comparisons provide no
significant difference, it will explain that there is not a difference in religiosity and partisanship.

Then I conclude with an analysis of how the research is practical to telling us more about
senatorial politics and what we can predict for the future in terms of religious rhetoric. Finally, I
answer the question: what does religious rhetoric look like on the Senate floor?
Chapter 4: Results and Conclusions

The 112th Congress uses .9 religious words per 1000 when they are giving floor speeches in the sample studied. At first this may seem small, but the average senator spoke over 108,000 words. This means each senator used roughly 97 religious centric words in floor speeches and on average 68% of floor speeches use at least one religious word in the sample.

This is a comprehensive look at how rhetoric was used in the 112th Congress. In the next section, I explain the difference between certain speeches and unpack a few examples of a religiously charged speech from the 112th Congress. Secondly, I address specific words they said that were important. I address the religious words per 1000 measure among the polarized senators. Finally, I conclude with additional remarks and conceptualize the findings.

Case Studies of Religious Speech from the 112th Congress

Religious speech is used in a variety of ways on the floor. It can be casual to use words like faith or spirit. Other words are used to end speeches like an occasional amen to signal the end of prayer. The most interesting usage is the direct use of rhetoric in an instrumental policy speech. Instrumental speech, as described above is the religious rhetoric used when arguments founded on religious concepts or beliefs are used to help sway a specific goal, such as passing legislation. In this section, I analyze four separate case studies in the 112th Congress to show instrumental use of religious rhetoric. Three of the four fall within the policy speech category and one of them is in the tribute speech category. I end the section analyzing the tribute speech of religious rhetoric in an honorarium speech of a specific constituent. While this rhetoric wouldn’t be instrumental, it is of the ceremonial to honor someone. The four senators I look at are Senator James Inhofe (R-OK), Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH), Senator Max Baucus (D-MT), and Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY).
Table 6: Case Study Senators and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Senator James Inhofe</th>
<th>Senator Sherrod Brown</th>
<th>Senator Max Baucus</th>
<th>Senator Mitch McConnell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Group</td>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>Evangelical Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW-Nominate</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>-0.452</td>
<td>-0.226</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Words per 1000 said</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Tribute Speech</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Policy Speech</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first example of religious speech on the floor comes from Senator James Inhofe (R-OK). As you can see on the table above. He is a Presbyterian falling into the Mainline Protestant category. He also is the most polarized senator of the case studies coming in at the 10th highest DW-Nominate score of .556. We are familiar with his rhetoric from the snowball dilemma in the introduction. This speech in particular was regarding Israel’s border with the middle eastern countries around it. At first, he praises Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for his efforts to bring up two points: Iran and Israel relations and Israel staying in its current state regarding its border. He then goes on to quote scripture use religious rhetoric to explain why terrorists hate the western world.

Mr. INHOFE … First of all, I am going to do something that is unusual on the floor of the Senate; that is, I am going quote Ephesians 6. Listen carefully. It
saying: *For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spirit wickedness in high places.*

It is significant that we look at that, because make no mistake about it, the war that was started 10 years ago and the war we are in right now, that we are fighting now, is first and foremost a *spiritual* war, not a political war--never has been a political war. It is not about politics. It is a *spiritual war*. It has its roots in *spiritual* conflict. It is a war to destroy the very fabric of our society and the very things for which we stand.

Many of the wars in history are wars where people are trying to take over something another country has. That is not what this is about. Not about getting mineral deposits, not about getting land from other countries. This is a different war.

It is not simple greed that motivates these people to kill. One may ask, what is it about our Nation that makes them--here I am talking about some of the Hamas, Hezbollah, the terrorists- hate us so much? I suggest there are three things. First, in our country we have the freedom and the right to choose the kind of *worship* we want. I happen to be a *Jesus* guy, a born-again *Christian*, all that. I believe the way to the *Lord God* is through his *Son*.

While I believe that, I believe every American has the right to choose whether he or she wants to believe that. Some people have the notion that if you are a *Christian* who believes in the *Bible*, you are totally intolerant, you do not allow other people to have a choice. Nothing can be further from the truth.

The nations of this world where *Christianity* is the dominant way of *worship*, we also find *Jewish synagogues*, we find *Islamic mosques*, we find freedom of *worship*. You will not find the same kind of things in the militant *Islamic* nations of this world. They do not allow *Christian* churches. They do not allow *synagogues* to open freely. They do not allow people the freedom. They persecute people. So one of the reasons America is hated so much is that we have allowed people through the years to choose what they are going to do. It is their choice.

The second reason we are hated so much is we have opened the door for people to achieve their *God-given* place on this Earth. We have not restrained people. We have allowed people freedom of expression, the freedom to pursue dreams, the freedom to pursue goals. This is not true in other places in the world. These freedoms are not found in every nation. America is great because we have magnified the rights of individuals, protected the rights of individuals in our culture. We are careful to allow people to have expressions in our society, and we are hated for it.
The third reason we are hated by these people is because we are a nation of laws. We are a people ruled by laws. Lest one think that is common, go around the world and look at these other countries in the world. Most of the world's countries do not have a 200-year-old Constitution. They are ruled by dictators. They are ruled by the whims of those leaders or by political parties as they change. The rule of law is what makes civilization possible. The rule of law is what makes an orderly society work. If there is no rule of law, the strongest, toughest bully on the block is the one who is running the country. America is a country of law and order. Because of this philosophy of the people who founded our Nation, they believed in the rule of law because of what they knew from the Bible. Our Constitution and the constitutions of most governments around the world, similar to ours, are, indeed, based on the Ten Commandments. Our fathers knew the Ten Commandments and the laws of God should be a basis for all laws. They understood the concept of absolute right and absolute wrong. There were not many who believed in what we call today situational ethics or where things change according to our needs. They believed in absolute right and absolute wrong. That is the reason we are hated so much as a nation.  

The instrumental religious rhetoric is present in this speech. The speech sample is 779 words long. He uses 28 religious words or phrases and almost 4% of the words he uses in this speech are religious in context. What is important, however, in this context is to see how and why he uses them. He makes a political statement including phrases like “I am a Jesus guy” and quoting scripture on the floor. He uses religion to influence his political stance on this issue and it shows how religious rhetoric can be used in an instrumental way on the floor. At the end of the day, I may not know why exactly he spoke religiously, however it very well could have been to reinforce with his constituents that he is religious.

This second example is different from Senator James Inhofe’s (R-OK) speech was. The next sample is Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH). As you can see on the table above again. He is a Lutheran falling into the Mainline Protestant category. He is the 5th most polarized Democrat

---

with a DW-Nominate score of -.452. He used the most religious rhetoric with 3.2 religious words per 1000 in the sample. He used a religious word roughly once for every 300 words he says on the Senate floor. This speech in particular was regarding blaming workers for the problems in the economy. He states how important unions are to the sector of the economy in Ohio and how fair wages and fair treatment is a necessity.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio … Management is important and crucial, but workers are important and crucial. As worker wages go up, management wages typically go up. But we have seen worker wages remain stagnant, in part because of a lack of unionization or a decline in unionization.

Now we are also seeing in Madison, Columbus, Trenton, Harrisburg, Indianapolis, Lansing, in these capital cities, especially in my part of the country, a real play on fear. They are trying to turn private sector workers against public sector workers. They blame the UAW--the auto workers--for the problems in the auto industry. Now they are blaming public workers for problems with State budgets and trying to work the private sector and union workers against each other, fighting with each other. That is the most base Karl Rove-type politics, to turn working-class people against one another. It is wrong. It is morally wrong, it is politically wrong, and it is very wrong for our country.

What has also been interesting about these protests is that they are not all steelworkers and electricians and American Federation of Government Employees and AFSCME and SCMU. There are people of faith also involved.

I did a roundtable at an Episcopal church right off statehouse square, and the leaders of the church and some of the volunteers of the church were there. Now, I don't preach or wear my Christianity on my sleeve, but these people of faith understand that the Bible talks a lot about poverty and a lot about fairness and equality and egalitarianism, if you will, but for them to go against workers on behalf of the richest people in our country--and that is really what they are doing in the Governors' offices in Columbus and Madison and Trenton and other places-runs counter at least to my faith. I will not judge their faith. They worship what God they worship and read what scripture they read. But when I look at what my faith means--and as I said, I am a Lutheran, I am not a Catholic--but when I look at Leo the XIII and what he said about what Catholicism means for workers and fairness, it is point, set, match. That clearly spoke definitively about this.19

---

Senator Sherrod Brown’s (D-OH) speech while different still uses instrumental rhetoric. Even though he states “Now I don’t preach or wear my Christianity on my sleeve”, he uses the most religious rhetoric in the religiosity analysis. It is ironic he says this and makes a statement about it, almost suggesting his non-religiosity. This speech is 400 words long. He uses in this speech sample, 20 religious words or phrases. This means almost 5% of the words he uses in this speech are religious in context. He uses the example of Pope Leo XIII of the Catholic faith to portraying a view of fairness towards workers. Senator Brown (D-OH) uses the religious rhetoric and religious round table he discusses to consider religious views on the policy. It once again shows the way he uses religious rhetoric in an instrumental way in policy speeches, even if the senator doesn’t wear religion “on his sleeve”.

The third example is a smaller yet still interesting example. Senator Max Baucus (D-MT) is a Mainline Protestant from Montana. He is the least polarized of the case study examples with a DW-Nominate score of -.226. In addition, he has the lowest religious words per 1000 at .61 words of speech being religious. This example is shorter and a dialogue between Senator John Cornyn (R-TX) and Senator Baucus (D-MT). Senator Cornyn (R-TX) was offering an amendment to a pending trade bill. Specifically, it had to deal with the trade of F-16 fighter jets to Taiwan. It seems as if this is a widely accepted amendment because it had bipartisan support and 47 signatures. However, Senator Baucus (D-MT) decided to yield time to discuss a piece of scripture useful in his process of thinking towards the amendment.

Mr. CORNYN. … I thank, on a bipartisan basis, the senators who have supported this legislation. I note that of the 47 signatories on the letters that have been made part of the record supporting this sale, 13 are from our Democratic friends across the aisle. This is truly a bipartisan effort.
For all the reasons I have mentioned, I hope we will vote yes and pass this important amendment to this bill.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brown of Ohio). Who yields time? The senior Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the book of Ecclesiastes contains wisdom that should guide us today, and I am paraphrasing. This is not exactly what the Scriptures say: For everything there is a season and a time for every matter under the Sun. Or, to state it more colloquially, there is a time and place for everything. Some times are better than others; some places are better than others.

My colleague from Texas offered an amendment that required the President to sell F-16 fighter jets to Taiwan. I, respectfully, note the debate on this trade adjustment assistance bill is not the appropriate time, season, or place to raise this issue. This is a trade bill. This is not about sales of F-16s to Taiwan or to any country. It is a wholly different subject. It has nothing to do with what we are trying to debate today and focus our attention on so we can get this legislation passed.20

Senator Baucus in his small statement uses a verse from the book of Ecclesiastes. He says he paraphrases the scripture saying: “For everything there is a season and a time for every matter under the Sun”. The actual scripture reads for everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven. (Ecclesiastes 3:1 English Standard Version) The scriptures continue as a poem to say there is a timing for a multitude of different life events in a person’s life. The way he uses religious rhetoric is different then Senator Inhofe’s (R-OK) and Senator Brown’s (D-OH). He uses it as an analogy to explain why we shouldn’t sale F-16 jets to Taiwan. The trade bill has nothing to do with selling F-16’s to anyone.

While this may not be seen in an instrumental view of rhetoric. It shows how Senator Baucus (D-MT) uses scripture different from Senator Inhofe (R-OK) in the first speech analyzed. Senator Baucus paraphrases scripture and uses it as an analogy. Senator Inhofe (R-OK) quotes scripture exactly and interprets it literally towards terrorists as it says: *For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spirit wickedness in high places.* (Ephesians 6:12 English Standard Version) The difference is important as they are the same religious group, but differ in party and how polarized they are. It denotes a way senators can use religious words or scripture in this case to bend to the point of view the commentator wants.

The final example is from Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY). He is an Evangelical Protestant with a DW-Nominate score of .419 and a 1.45 religious words per 1000. This case study is different from the rest because it is not a policy speech. This is an honorary resolution for one of his constituents. Her name is Pauline White and she did a lot of mission work in the state of Kentucky and therefore she is being honored for her contributions. These honorary resolutions are very common on the Senate floor and often have religious rhetoric in them as you can see below.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a woman who has answered a call to service, and given so freely of herself over the course of her fruitful lifetime. Ms. Pauline White of Cumberland, KY, has not ceased giving to her fellow man, even though she is entering her 80s. Contrary to what one may think, Ms. White has not let her age stop her from participating in the missionary work that is so dear to her heart.

Ms. White, who was working as a missionary in Sebring, FL, at the Association for Retarded Citizens in 2002, felt that she was called by God to come and bring aid to eastern Kentucky. She put up a ”For Sale” sign in her yard, and called a few of her lady friends to come over and help her begin to pack her belongings. Just a few hours later a couple knocked on the door, asked about the price of the house, and ended up buying the house in cash later that day. Ms. White did not
worry about selling her house for long, which she believed was just another sure sign from God that her journey to Kentucky was part of His plans.

Ms. White is now the director of Shepherd's Pantry, an outreach program in Cumberland, KY, that provides food for 500 to 900 low-income families on the second Wednesday of each month. Families that participate in the program are assigned appointments to come to the pantry and receive what Ms. White and her volunteers have worked so hard to prepare for them. At the pantry, the families are given food, personal hygiene items, and treats for their children. But according to Ms. White, the most important thing the families receive from Shepherd's Pantry is the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The volunteers at the pantry drop gospel tracts in each of the bags that the families receive, and then they wait for the Lord to move. The staff is always available to provide those in need with spiritual counseling.

Along with their aid of food to families in need, Shepherd's Pantry also distributes government commodities to low-income families, supplies breakfast for schoolchildren, and provides snacks to mission groups throughout the area.

Shepherd's Pantry has attracted volunteers from as far as Florida, and as close as London, KY. The volunteers come to witness God's work in the community. And according to Ms. White, they have yet to be disappointed. She says that God performs miracles week after week. Ms. White recalls one instance when the computer wiped out all of the names of the Pantry's clients and addresses. The staff tried just about everything to get the computer to turn back on, but nothing seemed to help. After much praying, the computer miraculously booted up and printed all 500 names, addresses, and emails. Upon hearing about the phenomenon, the mail station company said ``No way!'' Ms. White responded with, ``Yes, God's way!"

Ms. White has no intentions of ending her mission work anytime soon. She has handpicked a Bible verse in Psalms Chapter 91, Verse 11, which is very dear to her heart: ``For he will command his angels concerning you to guard you in all your ways.'' In Sebring, FL, in 2002, Ms. White heard a preacher speak of a lady who was still serving the Lord at 86 years old. She thought to herself, ``I still have 14 years to go!'' Ms. White offers this advice to other ``old folks'': ``When he calls, I think you need to consider his call and not your age."

The service and good works of Ms. Pauline White and Shepherd's Pantry have contributed mightily to the town of Cumberland, the surrounding region, and the entire Commonwealth of Kentucky. Ms. White is providing nourishment not just for her neighbors' bellies, but also for their spirits. Mr. President, at this time I would like to ask my colleagues in the U.S. Senate to join me in commemorating the great service of Ms. Pauline White.
Mr. President, I yield the floor.\textsuperscript{21}

The speech is 703 words long and contains 20 religious words or phrases. It also includes her favorite verse as well. In this speech, 2.8\% of the words were religious. The honorary speeches used in the Senate are a common practice and honor individual people and organizations. Often times these are religious in nature. This example is specifically religious because of how religious Pauline White seems to be. Senator McConnell talks about her mission from God and how He brought her to Kentucky. She started a non-profit called Shepherd’s Pantry to help contribute through religious charity.

This example shows a different avenue religious rhetoric is used on the floor. It is still as important as the instrumental use of religious rhetoric because of the credit claiming they can take from resolutions or ceremonial rhetoric. It is easiest to talk about religion in these contexts without stepping on the toes of other people. Any senator can commemorate any organization or person he or she sees fit. Therefore, this can be used as a tool to help portray an image of the senator that is positive towards religion.

In the case studies, I wanted to look at more polarized senators and differing characteristics among them. As you can remember from the table of characteristics, the policy speeches were all from Mainline Protestants. They all used scripture or the view towards scripture in different ways. Senator Brown (D-OH) walks on eggshells around religious rhetoric claiming to not wear his Christianity on his sleeve. It is almost ironic because of his religious words per 1000 being the highest among all senators. Senator Inhofe (R-OK) interprets the

scripture and words he uses as literal and forecasts what we should do because of what it says. Finally, Senator Baucus paraphrases scripture to give an analogy to why non-topical legislation should be saved for its own time and place. They all use it in different ways and that is okay. It helps understand that not all religious rhetoric is the same in its use and gives us practical ways it is used in the daily vernacular.

The Important Words They Use

In the 112th Congress, 9,290 religious words were used on the Senate floor in the sample. On average, almost 1 word per 1000 was religious. The religious words are all in the appendix and have explanations for each word or word groups to show why they are in the the word bank. The selection process for the words involved multiple sources and adding/removing words deemed necessary. Some were chosen because of the close relationship with religion and the first words to come to mind when thinking of religious rhetoric (i.e. God, Jesus, Amen, Islam, etc.) Some were chosen from prior religious rhetoric studies on the Presidents. Finally, some were chosen from a religious rhetoric dictionary and were hand picked by myself for words I thought would be present on the floor. In the rest of this section, I present the results for each word and talk about a few specific words and why they may have provided a lot of the religious rhetoric findings.
Table 7: Results of Religious Words for 112th Congress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>advent</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deacon</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jewish</td>
<td>9146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunday school</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faith</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faith</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faith</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faith</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see from the table above, some words are significantly used more than others.

The top four words are spirit, church, faith, and God. These are broad religious terms compared to words that could have been at the top. Spirit and faith were two of the top words and are words used in religious contexts (i.e. Holy Spirit) or in non-religious contexts (i.e. the Spirit of the Law). As said previously, the non-religious context is important because the connotation still has religious implications. The word church was used 775 times on the Senate floor and 357 times or 46% of the time it was used in a policy speech. This is significant because it shows that even though these are broad religious terms one may use, almost half of the times they said them it was in policy speeches. Finally, God is the most religious of the words in the sample study and it was used 59% of the time in policy speeches. This is interesting because the expectation for a broad religious term is for the majority of them to come in honorary speeches like the Senator...
McConnell case study in the last section. However, all four of the top words are used more then 45% of the time in policy speeches.

Table 8: Percentage of 4 Top Words and Type of Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tribute</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Random</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the most said words, there are also a significant number of words that were not said at all during the 112th Congress. A total of 11 words out of 110 were not said at all. The 4 religion affiliation specific words (evangelism, fundamentalism, Hinduism, and scientology) were not used because of how specific they were. They were in a context to be used only if they talked specifically about the religion as a whole. The word Quran was not used because the transcribers of the congressional record preferred the alternative spelling as follows: Koran. The majority of the other words that were not said (Allah, atheist, demon, Satan, and supernatural) are those I like to consider as religious bad words. Each one has a secondary connotation that would be unprofessional to use on the Senate floor. A senator would most likely not refer to Allah on the Senate floor because there are no Muslims in the Senate and it is often associated with Islamist extremism. Atheist is someone who doesn’t believe in God and so the reason this one is considered a bad word is because evangelicals often associate it with people of no morals. It is therefore understandable why senators would not want to speak of someone in that connotation. The rest are all associated with taboo. Demon, Satan, and the supernatural are all apart of a relation to dark forces and something most senators would not like to touch with a ten-foot pole due to its taboo nature.
In all, some words are more said then other words on the Senate floor. The most said words were all used more in policy speeches on average over tribute or random speeches. The results show each word and how many times total it was said in the 112th Congress. Finally, some words are simply not mentioned due to the nature of the words themselves or the taboo surrounding them.

**The Religiosity of the Senators**

The research question begs the answer of how religious rhetoric is used on the Senate floor. I have already shown case studies of speeches of the 112th Congress that were religiously charged. In addition, I showed that some religious words are used a lot and some are never used. Also the most used words are generally used in policy speeches as well. This next and final section looks at the grouping mean analysis and the religious word per 1000 variable alongside polarization scores.

The religious words per 1000 finding was found for each senator during the session. The results had varying ranges from the highest being 3.2 religious words per 1000 belonging to Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH) to the lowest being .22 religious words per 1000 belonging to Senator Bob Corker (R-TN). The results can be found for each senator in the table below. The mean of all senators was .86 religious words per 1000 and the standard deviation was .44. This means Senator Corker’s (R-TN) results were well within expected results of the analysis. However, Senator Brown’s (D-OH) were not within the expected results and is a definite outlier in the study.
After finding the results above, the next step was a comparison of the religious words per 1000 and the polarization DW-Nominate scores that were already explained in the Methodology section. The results yielded an interesting finding that there is no correlation with how polarized a senator is and the number of religious words the senator uses per 1000. These results are shown in the two graphs below that separate the polarization scores by positive and negative or by party to show there is no statistically significant correlation among the two variables.
Figure 5: Religious Words Per 1000 Measure and Democratic Senators DW-Nominate
The original assumption was that as polarization scores increased as would religious rhetoric. However, it seems, if any, the opposite is more true. The religious rhetoric slightly decreases among more polarized senators. The null result of the hypothesis gives an interesting finding in of itself because it shows regardless of how conservative or liberal a senator may be has little to no effect on how much religious rhetoric they like to use on the Senate floor.

In addition to the question of polarization and religious rhetoric, the groupings study of means was also useful in seeing how and which senators use religious rhetoric. Each senator was grouped by age, gender, race, profession, party, and religious affiliation. A comparison of the groupings was utilized by itself and in association of party. The results yielded no statistically significant findings, however it did yield a few interesting comparisons among party affiliation.
In the 112th Congress, Democratic senators used more religious rhetoric than Republican senators. Democrats used .91 religious words per 1000 whereas Republicans only used .8 religious words per 1000. Even with the outlier Senator Brown (D-OH) removed from the comparison, Democrats still used .86 religious words per 1000. In the graph below you can see the comparison among the parties and it is significant for the party comparison among other groupings because even though Democrats used more religious rhetoric on average, there were still groupings that the Republicans used more religious rhetoric in.

Figure 7: Religious Words Per 1000 Measure by Religious Affiliation
Another interesting grouping analyzed with party was religious affiliation. In the above graph, I did a comparison of means across all the religious affiliations with each one separated by party as well. Overall, the Catholic religious’ affiliation uses more rhetoric than the others. Another significant finding above is the difference between Democrats and Republicans of the Evangelical religious affiliation. Even though evangelicals lean more Republican in voting, the evangelical Democrats use more religious rhetoric on the Senate floor. Finally, other than the Catholic affiliation by a small margin, the Republicans only used more religious rhetoric in the other affiliation. I posit this happened because the 3 unaffiliated senators whom don’t identify with a religion are in this category. All three of them are Democrats as well, so it is likely the finding is due to non-religious senators whom are Democrats using less religious rhetoric than Republicans in the other category.
The rest of the groupings were also paired with party. Age, gender, profession, and race were the minor groupings in the project and were used to see if any of them gave significant value to the religiosity. While the minor groupings did provide differences among themselves and party, the groupings did not affect amount of religious words per 1000. The graphs below give the results to show the relative differences.

As you can see in the profession and religious rhetoric graph, lawyers and military background use higher religious rhetoric then the other professions. Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH) explains why there is a large discrepancy between the party and religious rhetoric used for the past military profession. However, the lawyer profession isn’t as easily explained. They make up a majority of senators as most started off as a lawyer before going into politics. My theory posits that since lawyers are familiar with the influence of rhetoric in the court room, they use it more wisely on the Senate floor. Therefore, it is likely the higher average results from a higher understanding of rhetoric as a whole. The claim is not highly regarded, but the logical claim makes sense.
Figure 9: Religious Words Per 1000 Measure by Profession

Figure 10: Religious Words Per 1000 Measure with Profession and Party
Gender provides another difference among the grouping itself. Even though it once again showed no significant effect on religious rhetoric, women all across the board used more rhetoric then men. Among men, the average was .83 religious words per 1000. For the Republican men the average was .76 and for the Democrat men it was .91. Among women, the average was .99 religious words per 1000. For the Republican women the average was 1.15 and for the Democrat women it was .92. So as you can see, women as a whole were less afraid to use religious rhetoric on the floor then men as a whole. Even within the parties the discrepancy shows it has little to no effect on Democrats as they use relatively the same amount. Whereas, the Republicans are a lot different depending on whether you are male or female.

Figure 11: Religious Words Per 1000 Measure by Gender
As previous literature discussed, religious rhetoric increases as age increases. However, this is actually the opposite in the 112th Congress. The 40-49 year olds use on average significantly more regardless of party. The trend goes down in religious rhetoric other than the large discrepancy of the 50-59 year olds between the parties. Republicans of the 50-59 age bracket use significantly less religious rhetoric than its party or age counterparts. Democrats in the 50-59 age bracket, on the other hand, are on par with the 40-49 age bracket. They are relatively consistent until age 60 where the decrease begins to occur for the Democrats. Regardless, a correlation seems to exist as age increase religious rhetoric actually decrease as opposed to what the previous literature suggests about the general public.
Figure 13: Religious Words Per 1000 Measure by Age

Figure 14: Religious Words Per 1000 Measure with Age and Party
Due to the total number of the race not being diverse, it is hard to extract useful distinctions out of the graph above. However, it is interesting to see on average how much higher the Hispanic rhetoric on the Republicans is compared to the Democrats. The two Hispanic Republicans were in the upper quartile for all Republicans.

Throughout this chapter, the case studies provided real examples from the 112th Congress and how religious rhetoric can be used in policy and tribute speeches. The words the senators used gave information to which words were used most on the floor and which words were not used. Of those, the most said words were shown to be used more in policy speeches. Finally, the last section focused on the relationship between polarization and religious rhetoric. The results showed no correlation and the groupings also showed no significant effect determining the religious rhetoric of the senators. While the results showed interesting findings about the groupings themselves, it had no effect on the amount of religious rhetoric used as a whole.
Bringing it all together

In Senator Inhofe’s (R-OK) snowball speech. He used a multitude of religious words and he referred to scriptures in his speech. A speech of his religious magnitude and the case studies looked over provide some of the most religiously charged speeches on the Senate floor from the 112th Congress. It is important to note the .86 religious words per 1000 is a relatively small number. On average, only 1 religious word is said in a long speech given on the Senate floor. I predict most religious words are grouped in speeches due to the words likeness and compatibility to be used together. Therefore, a lot of speeches on the Senate floor use no religious rhetoric whatsoever. In all, religious rhetoric on the Senate floor is uncommon, but when it is used it shows how and sometimes why the religious rhetoric is used and this was ultimately my research question.

A lot of the previous literature gave information on how presidential religious rhetoric has been studied. This project expanded on the work presented and provided a similar look into the Senate. The God strategy posited by Domke and Coe was hard to determine among all 101 senators. In the case studies, the God strategy was very present in Senator Inhofe’s (R-OK) as he described Israeli relations. However, the God strategy wasn’t as present in the other speeches with Senator Brown (D-OH) going so far as to say “I don’t wear my Christianity on my sleeve”. The categorization of religious rhetoric helped understand the policy and tribute speeches as either instrumental or ceremonial. Ultimately, religious rhetoric is a by product of an individual and can’t be thrown to the wayside in politics.

The 112th Congress is homogenous in gender and race, but different in other ways including party and religious affiliation. Each senator is different in terms of characteristics to describe them. Groupings emerged to help quantify different sects within the 112th Congress.
The Democrats held a majority of the Senate and it was a very polarized Senate compared to its past. Republicans were more polarized then Democrats and were also less diverse in terms of gender and race. Religious affiliations, age, and profession were relatively split among Senate and parties.

The word count analysis was unique to this project and gave a lot of information on what words were said and which ones weren’t. It also allowed me to see whether words were enveloped in policy, tribute, or random speeches as well. The python computer program was able to do some of the work, however a lot of the work was personal work on excel spreadsheets to separate the data and create the religious words per 1000 variable. The categorizations and the groupings allowed for a comprehensive analysis of what all was said, by whom, in what speech, and by which group. The analysis was supplemented by case studies to give real examples of speech on the floor. These case studies further showed how and why senators use religious rhetoric in different circumstances. The words they use are similar and are used in majority of policy speeches if the words are used. Finally, polarization and religious rhetoric are not statistically correlated and have no significant influence on each. Neither do the groupings have a significant effect on the religious rhetoric as well.

Multiple conclusions can be drawn from the project. The first conclusion is that no correlation exists between religious rhetoric and polarization. If any, it is opposite as expected. A second conclusion is that religion has no impact on how much religious rhetoric is used. The third is that the other variables of profession, age, gender, party, or race have no statistically significant effect on religious rhetoric. Ultimately the fourth is religious rhetoric is not determined by any characteristics of an individual.
The three primary factors as explained in Chapter 1 are key to understanding these conclusions. The contextual factors had a small influence because as age decreased religious rhetoric increased slightly. The political influence also had influence as Democrats used more religious rhetoric then Republicans and polarization had no effect on religious rhetoric. Finally, personal influences had almost no influence as religious affiliation was not significant comparative to the amount of religious rhetoric used. Overall, these primary factors may influence Senate rhetoric as a whole, but it doesn’t seem to affect it enough to draw a conclusion about it.

In conclusion, the answer to why and how Senators use religious rhetoric is hard to answer. From the analysis, we don’t know why certain Senators use religious rhetoric then others. The primary factors and polarization do not have enough influence to correlate which Senators or groupings of senators use religious rhetoric. The how is more answerable from the case studies and analysis of which words and when they use the. We do know the most religious words are used in policy speeches at least 46% of the time. senators use instrumental rhetoric on the Senate floor. There is no group or party or more polarized senators who use more religious rhetoric then the rest.

The restraints of this study is that it is hard to tell how religious someone is. Religion is very personal to some and may explain why there is no correlation among the senators. It is quite possible religious words used on the Senate floor depend on the situations going on or how each individual senator feels about bringing religion into the mix. I posit this ultimately explains why certain senators use religious rhetoric and certain ones don’t. It depends on the circumstance and the individual talking to determine whether it is necessary to bring religious rhetoric to the Senate floor.
Appendix
List of Religious Words Explained

Advent- A season of preparation for Christmas in most modern day churches. This is in a similar category as religious holiday in terms of rhetoric.

Allah- A term in Islam, meaning “God” in Arabic. Used in conversations about Islamic fundamentalism.

Amen- An utterance signifying the ending of a prayer. Usually if prayer is said on the Senate floor, this is said at least once.

Angel- A superhuman intermediary between the divine and human realm. Used in terms the phrase “guardian angel” or in terms of a prayer.

Apocalypse- Catastrophic end time battle between good and evil and good always wins. Used comparison and analogies.

Apostle- It refers to both the mission and representational authority of someone sent on a mission. Used in two different contexts: Referring to Christ’s 12 Apostle and being an Apostle to the faith.

Ash Wednesday- The first day of Lent in the western world, where individuals spread ashes on their forehead as a sign of penitence or mortality. Used in a holiday context.

Atheism- A belief that God does not exist. Used to describe people who

Atheist- *refer to Atheism

Baptism- The rite of applying water to a person, usually marking his or her entrance into the Christian Church. Used in terms of celebration of this event with resolutions or other speeches

Baptist- Protestants that originated from 17th century English Puritanism. The term “Baptist” came from their insistence that baptism should be reserved for those old enough to comprehend and confess a personal faith in Jesus. Used in a denominational context.

Bible- The sacred text for Christians, comprising of the Old and New Testaments. Used in any reference with scriptures or in reference to the book itself.

Bishop- A senior member of the clergy who is charge of a diocese or association of congregations or parishes. Used to refer to the people in honor or in reference to.
Blasphemy- An act or verbal offense that mocks beliefs, sacred beings, or objects in a certain religion. Used in terms of pointing out the mocking nature of another person’s beliefs.

Buddhism- A world religion founded by Siddhartha Gautama, the Buddha in the 6th or 5th century BCE in India. Teaching reincarnation and freedom from worldly attachments. Used in terms of the denominational religion.

Buddhist- Used in terms of a person who is of the faith.

Catholic- Used in terms of a person who is of the faith.

Catholicism- The largest of Christianity’s three main branches. It maintains a hierarchy of bishops and priests, with the pope as the clerical leader. Notable differences from Protestantism also include the veneration of the Virgin Mary and other saints; the importance of church traditions, and the celibacy of the priesthood. Used to describe the denominational religion.

Chapel- A small building for Christian worship, typically one attached to an institution or private house. Used to describe smaller churches at Universities and other institutions and referring to that.

Christian- Adherents of the Christian religion. Used to describe these people.

Christmas- A Christian holiday generally celebrated on December 25th that commemorates the birth of Jesus Christ. Used to celebrate the holiday and commemoration on the Senate floor.

Church- A building, program or service providing religious goods to a certain constituency and a specific geographical location. It also represents a Christian community founded on the teachings of Jesus Christ. Used in terms of the place and on an individual basis.

Clergy- Ordained leaders who carry out religious duties. Used in honorary terms and in reference to individuals who may be part of the clergy.

Communion- The Christian commemoration of Christ’s last supper by partaking of elements of bread and wine. Used in the context of the event used in churches today.

Congregation- Any local gathering of believers for worship. Used in the context of referring to ones own congregation.

Deacon- A minister ranking below a priest in the Anglican, Catholic, and Orthodox churches. In most Protestant churches, deacons are not ordained and are seen as people who assist the clergy. Used in terms of honoring this position in own local church.
**Demon** - A superhuman being between humans and gods, which can have benevolent or malevolent intentions based on the religious tradition. Used in a negative form to describe someone as evil.

**Diocese** - The wider regional structure connecting parishes and other local organization that is overseen by a bishop. Used to describe certain diocese within a senator's state.

**Disciple** - Similar to Apostle*

**Easter** - A Christian holiday commemorating the resurrection of Jesus Christ three days after his crucifixion. Used to celebrate the holiday and specific time of year.

**Elder** - In various churches, especially the Presbyterian-Reformed tradition, the elders are laypeople who share authority and leadership with the clergy. Used in terms of honoring this position in own local church.

**Episcopalian** - Someone of the Anglican Communion or in the Anglican tradition. Used to describe some who is an adherent of the episcopacy.

**Evangelical** - Refer to Evangelicalism. Used to describe someone who adheres to evangelicalism.

**Evangelicalism** - The Christian practice of sharing the gospel of Christ with non-believers. Used to refer to the practice and faith of specific senators.

**Faith** - Is the observation of confidence or trust in a person or thing. Used to proclaim confidence and could be used in a non-religious context to proclaim faith to a number of things.

**Fundamentalism** - A movement of Protestants embracing similar beliefs as evangelicals, although usually in a more conservative direction, stressing separation from the world and from more liberal Christian bodies. Also used to describe other conservative movements in other religious, particularly Islam. Used mostly in terms of other religions and in relation to Islam.

**God** - Common term for the supreme and sole deity. Used in a lot of different ways like “in God we trust” etc.

**Good Friday** - The Friday before Easter and an important Holy Week observance for Christians. It functions as a somber time of reflection and mediation with regards to the crucifixion. Used near time of the holiday to express celebration.

**Gospel** - The story and life of Jesus Christ told in the 4 canonical Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Used in terms of referring to this story and telling it to people.

**Grace** - The term refers to an expression of unmerited divine love and assistance given to humans from God. In Christianity, God’s grace is expressed through the sacrifice of his Son,
Jesus Christ, on the cross for the redemption of human sin. Used in many ways as well to show forgiveness of something. Used in similar terms and could be in non-religious terms

**Heaven**- The dwelling place of God, angels, and redeemed individuals in the after life. It functions as the ultimate reward for the redeemed, as opposed to hell, which is the punishment for the damned.

**Hell**- Similar to Heaven*

**Hinduism**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Holy**- Similar to Sacred*

**Icon**- A religious sacred image usually looked up to. Could be used in religious or non-religious contexts.

**Idol**- Similar to Icon*

**Idolatry**- Similar to Icon*

**Islam**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Islamic**- Similar to Islam*

**Jesus**- The founder of the Christian religion. He was the messiah and leader of the faith and a man who lived 2000 years ago. Used when referring to his holiness or at the end of prayers.

**Jewish**- Deviation of Religious affiliation.

**Jihad**- Arabic for “to struggle”. Muslim extremists and critics of Islam emphasize as a “holy war”, while most Muslims do not. Used in reference to Islamist Extremism and Terrorism.

**Judaism**-Similar to Jewish

**Karma**- A term referring to both action and the consequences of those actions. Used mostly as a good actions doctrine instead of the religious

**Koran**- The sacred texts for Muslims similar to the Islamic Bible.

**Lent**- Religious Holiday

**Lutheran**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Mass**- Religious service for Catholics

**Messiah**- The long awaited king who will come in the last days. Could be referring to one that is to come or Jesus depending on the religious affiliation.

**Methodist**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Minister**- One who performs a number of church duties. Used in honorary terms to congratulate them mostly.
**Miracle**- A desirable effect believed to be caused by the intervention of god or gods in worldly matters. Could be used in this connotation or in an exaggerating context to proclaim something unlikely to occur.

**Mitzvah**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Mormon**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Mosque**- Muslim meeting place. Similar to Church*

**Muhammad**- Prophet in the Muslim faith. Similar to Jesus in the way used*

**Muslim**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**New Testament**- Refer to Scripture*. Written about Jesus and his followers in the early Christian church

**Old Testament**- Refer to Scripture*. Written about prophets before Jesus proclaiming messiah to come and other stories.

**Parish**- Refer to Congregation*

**Passover**- Religious Holiday

**Pastor**- Refer to Minister*

**Pope**- The appointed leader of the Roman Catholic Church

**Prayer**- Communication addressed to God or Gods. Used to refer to the daily opening prayer.

**Presbyterian**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Priest**- Refer to Minister*

**Prophecy**- A mode of communication between divine and specific humans to give a dialogue or calling from God.

**Prophet**- One who gives Prophecy.

**Protestant**- Deviation of Religious affiliation

**Quran**- Refer to Quran

**Rabbi**- Jewish equivalent of Pastor

**Ramadan**- Religious Holiday

**Religion**- Very general explanations for existence.

**Resurrection**- The belief that the dead will rise on some day in the future for final judgment. In reference specifically to Jesus’s resurrection.
Ritual- Collective ceremonies having a common focus and mood in which the common focus is on a god or gods. Could also be used in a non-religious context to talk about activities that happen often.

Sabbath- The last day of the week for rest. Usually Sunday’s for most faiths and senators.

Sacred- Things set apart or forbidden or consisting of natural goodness. It usually refers to something that is holy.

Saint- A category of holy person in the Catholic faith. It is used to honor someone for being especially holy or committing of miracles.

Salvation- The belief that human requires deliverance due to the problem of sin.

Satan- A malevolent figure in the Abrahamic religions. Anti-God.

Science- Study of living things. Strictly here to compare difference between religion and science.

Scientology- Deviation of Religious affiliation

Scripture- A term often used to denote sacred writings of different religions.

Secular- Someone or something not identified as religious or spiritual.

Seminary- An institution that educates clergy, theologians, and other professionals for religious service.

Semitism- Similar to Jewish*

Sermon- A message on a religious topic preached by clergy and other leaders of a congregation during worship.

Sin- An act against religious law.

Soul- The animating force conjoined with the body in a human being.

Spirit- General term for minor supernatural beings, especially disembodied ghosts. It could be used to refer to the spirit of the law.

Spiritual- Refer to Spiritual*

Sunday School- An educational ministry for children and adults usually held before or after worship services. Some senators are teachers.

Supernatural- A term referring to forces or entities beyond or outside nature that can suspend, alter, or ignore physical forces.

Taliban- Islamic militants who were trained in Pakistani refugee camps during the Russo-Afghan war. It is used to refer to terrorism

Temple- Refer to Church*

**Theology** - The study of God and of his relationship with created reality.

**Torah** - Jewish Old Testament. Similar to Bible.

**Trinity** - The Christian term for the community of God made of three “persons”.

**Worship** - The public and ritual honor given to God in the name of Jesus Christ. It is also a term to refer to singing and public affirmations for God in a worship service.

**Yom Kippur** - Jewish Religious Holiday, similar to Jewish*
import re
import os
import glob

# Define constants and functions

words = []
word_counts = {}
single_word_counts = {}

word_file = "words.csv"
output_file = open("results/results.csv", 'w');

def zero_counts():
    for word in words:
        word_counts[word] = [0,0,0]
    zero_single_counts()

def zero_single_counts():
    for word in words:
        single_word_counts[word] = 0

def populate_words():
    current_file = open(word_file, 'r')

    for line in current_file:
        words.append(line.rstrip().lower())

    current_file.close()
    zero_counts()

def num_occurrences(line, word):
    split_line = re.split(r'\W', line.lower())
    split_word = re.split(r'\W', word.lower())

    count = 0
```python
j = 0
for i in range(0, len(split_line)):
    if j == len(split_word):
        count += 1
        j = 0
    if split_line[i] == split_word[j]:
        j += 1
    else:
        j = 0

return count

def count_words(filename):
    current_file = open(filename, 'r')

    for line in current_file:
        line = line.rstrip()
        m = re.search(',(0|1|2)$', line)
        if m:
            group = int(m.group(0)[-1])
            for word in single_word_counts.keys():
                word_counts[word][group] += single_word_counts[word]
            zero_single_counts()
        else:
            for word in words:
                single_word_counts[word] += num_occurences(line, word)

    current_file.close()

    def output_results(filename):
        name = re.split(r'\W', filename)

        for word in words:
            output_file.write(word + "(0)," + word + "(1)," + word + "(2),"

        output_file.write("\n")

        for word in words:
            output_file.write(str(word_counts[word][0]) + "," + str(word_counts[word][1]) + "," + str(word_counts[word][2]) + ",")

        output_file.write("\n")
```
# Run through files

populate_words()

for filename in glob.glob("inputs/*.csv"):  
    print(filename)

    if filename == word_file:
        continue

    count_words(filename)
    output_results(filename)
    zero_counts()


http://www.npr.org/sections/itsallpolitics/2013/01/22/169998659/divine-rhetoric-god-in-the-inaugural-address


