

METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX: DATA AND METHODS

Word Count: 3662

The Votes

The Council votes used in this paper were entered (into Microsoft Access) from photocopies of the original votes obtained from the Vatican Secret Archive (*Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Cortile del Belvedere*, 00120 Vatican City). Each bishop name, diocese name, title and vote was entered twice by two different assistants, discrepancies corrected, and then checked a third time. Each of the votes matches the official totals provided by the Vatican at the time of the Council, unless a discrepancy is noted.

Four of the votes in our dependent variable were binary votes, on which the bishops indicated that they either wanted to accept or reject the proposal or document on the Council floor:¹

1. The Vote on the Sources of Revelation (First Session, November 20, 1962, *Suffragationes*, Volume I: No. 5) was one of the first votes taken during the Council. The issue concerned whether the conservative preparatory schema which upheld the inerrancy of the Bible; refuted the validity of historical or anthropological research into the Bible, and asserted that there were two sources of revelation - scripture and tradition (tradition in this sense meaning Church interpretation or doctrine), needed revision. Progressives were concerned with toning down the focus on the two sources, because Protestants had long argued that the only valid source of revelation was scripture. The progressive position, that the conservative

¹ Small numbers of amendments (which will be discussed in greater detail below) were recorded for the binomial votes (one or two per 2000 votes), but were dropped from the analysis because this was not an official option.

schema needed revision won, with 1,368 placets (1 in our database), compared to the 822 conservative non placets (0 in our database) (Rynne 1965: 90).²

2. The First Vote on the Blessed Virgin Mary (Second Session, October 29, 1963, *Suffragationes*, Volume XIX: No. 97) was the most divisive of all the votes taken during the Council, with 1115 voting to include Mary on the schema in the Church (the progressive position, 1 in our database, because it entailed de-emphasizing Catholic devotion to Mary in order to be more compatible with Protestant views), and 1075 voting to give her a separate schema (0 in our database).³
3. The Vote on the fourth point on Collegiality (Second Session, October 30, 1963, *Suffragationes*, Volume XX: No. 104) questioned whether the Council would approve the most progressive statement on collegiality, which essentially stated that when acting together with the Pope, the bishops also have ultimate authority and are infallible. The most progressive position passed with majority support with 1717 placets (1 in our database) to 408 non-placets (0 in our database).⁴
4. The Vote on the Propositions on Religious (Third Session, November 12, 1964, *Suffragationes*, Volume XLVIII: No. 242) had to do with whether the fairly conservative document about the role and activities of nuns and brothers should be

² Many felt that this vote was oddly worded (perhaps intentionally), in that the typical wording would ask for approval of a document, and a non-placet vote would reject that document, whereas this vote asked whether an “interruption in the debate was needed.”

³ Two bishops whose votes were isolated on the last page of this vote and excluded from the Vatican’s official totals have been included here (one placet and one non-placet).

⁴ The last page of this vote seems to have been lost, because 15 bishops whose last names start with Z are missing. I extrapolated their votes using their votes on the Third Point on Collegiality (which occurred on the same, at the same time and was highly correlated with the Fourth Point). The totals in our database now match the official totals.

retained. The conservative position won with 1155 placets (0 in our database) in favor of keeping the document to 882 non-placets (1 in our database). The Council ultimately did radically renew religious life because progressive leaders marshaled their supporters and had them submit amendments on the individual votes on thirteen of the propositions later in the Council (Rynne 1968: 392).

Three of the votes were trinomial because Council rules allowed the bishops to reject, accept, or accept documents in their later stages with certain conditions. These “conditions” were often referred to as the “*modi*,” as the proper term for them was *juxta modi* (or “with modifications”). These three votes were more difficult to code as progressive or conservative, because the *modi* could have been requesting either conservative or progressive revisions.⁵ To determine whether the *modi* were progressive or conservative, we cross-tabbed them with earlier binomial votes on the same issue when one was available.⁶ Individuals who submitted *modi*, but did not vote on the earlier votes were dropped. The three trinomial votes were:

5. The Final vote on Collegiality (Third Session, September 30, 1964, *Suffragationes*, Volume XXXV: No. 180) sought approval of the final Council document. It passed with more than the necessary two-thirds straight approval of the document with

⁵ They were usually statements drafted by one of the two major informal “social movement organizations” at the Council (Author Reference Removed), and simply submitted along with the bishops’ punch-card with his signature.

⁶ *Modi* were actually a much more radical statement than an original “accept” would have been on a binomial vote, and thus there is almost no likelihood that bishops would have completely changed their positions between votes and submitted a extremely progressive *modi* when they had originally voted conservatively. We used the first vote on the BVM to determine which category to put the *modi* on the second vote on the BVM, and the fourth vote on Collegiality to determine which category to put the *modi* in on the final vote on Collegiality.

only 42 non-placets rejecting it (the most conservative position, 0 in our database), 1624 placets accepting it (the moderate position, 2 in our database), and 572 modi (progressive modi are a 3 and conservative modi a 1 in our database) requesting amendments.

6. The Final Vote on the Blessed Virgin Mary (Third Session, October 29, 1964, *Suffragationes*, Volume XLII: No. 215) sought approval of the final Council document. It passed with more than the necessary two-thirds straight approval, with only 10 non-placets. (the most conservative position, 0 in our database), 1559 placets accepting it (the moderate position, 2 in our database) and 521 modi (progressive modi are a 3 and conservative modi a 1 in our database) requesting amendments.
7. The Vote on the Missions Schema (Fourth Session, November 11, 1965, *Suffragationes*, Volume XC: No. 455) asked the bishops to approve a document which rejected some important administrative reforms for the Church in missionary countries written by Indian bishops. The document did not receive the necessary two-thirds approval, with 9 non-placets (the most conservative position, a 0 in our database), 1428 placets (the moderate position, 2 in our database) and 712 modi (progressive modi are a 3 and conservative modi a 1 in our database) requesting amendments. Rynne notes that the vast majority of the modi on this topic requested that the drafting committee institute the Indian reforms, the majority of which were ultimately not adopted in the final document.⁷

⁷ We did not have an earlier binomial vote on the same topic with which we could determine the nature of the modi on the Missions Schema, so we used Final Collegiality because it was closer in substance than any other topic on which we had prior votes. It is not likely that an individual who voted progressively on Final Collegiality would have submitted a conservative modi on the

Together, we use these seven contentious votes as an indication of a bishop's overall progressivism or conservatism. To create the dependent variable, we first gave each bishop a 3 if he voted validly and 0 if he did not for each vote, to get a total for the number of times he voted ranging from 0-21⁸. We then totaled his score on each of the votes he voted on (assigning a 3 for a progressive vote on the binary votes (doing so in order to avoid weighting the trinomial votes more heavily in the scale) to create a progressive scale which ranges from 0-21. We then divided the progressive scale by the vote scale and multiplied it by 100 to determine the percentage of times each bishop voted progressively.

Coding and Analyzing Countries

vote on the Missions Schema, since such positions would be absolute polar opposites of each other. Using Final Collegiality, we obtained a ratio of progressive to conservative modi similar to that noted by other sources (450 progressive and 56 conservative modi after marking out for those who did not vote on Final Collegiality) (Rynne 1968: 549).

⁸ Only bishops who voted on at least three of the seven votes are included in the dependent variable. 62 of the 450 bishops missing on the dependent variable never voted validly on any of the seven votes. 214 voted validly, but only once. Of those 214, 90 likely died early in the Council, because they only voted on the first vote from the First Session. 82 of those 214 were most likely some of their replacements, as they only voted on the last vote in the database. An additional 174 bishops only voted on two of the seven votes. We ran an OLS regression on the vote scale with the US as reference category. Bishops from Germany and France were significantly more likely than those from the US to vote. Bishops from the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Hungary, Malta, Poland, and Puerto Rico were significantly less likely to vote than bishops from the US.

We found the majority of bishops' biographical information in the AP (1965), which was usually listed under his diocese name, and used the diocese address to code country of service if it was available. If information was not available for a particular bishop in 1965, his information was obtained from the most recent year of the AP that he was in.

The time of Vatican II was a tumultuous political one for many areas of the world, particularly those in Africa, Asia and Central and South America who had been colonized by major European powers. Many countries at this time were gaining independence, or would soon, and as a result, many of the often arbitrary colonial borders underwent significant changes, with some countries which had been divided by two or more colonial powers combining into one country, and with other unified countries splitting into two or more countries once the colonial power had vacated.

Needless to say, such flux in borders, governments and country names made assigning country characteristics particularly difficult for some of the bishops in our database, and this is not counting those which the Church did not identify for reasons of its own. For example, the AP did not differentiate between East and West Germany, North and South Korea, nor did it differentiate between many African countries, referring to them by general geographic region. For those bishops who were in a questionable country we obtained their countries of service by looking-up their city names (usually given under the diocese address) in a gazetteer from 1965.⁹ Doing so allowed us to obtain country information for the majority of bishops in our database.

⁹ These were: Germany, Korea, Vietnam, Ireland, The Democratic Republic of Congo and the Republic of Congo, and all countries categorized as "Equatorial" or "Occidental Africa."

Examining the effect of countries with our country dummies, presented in Table A1 proved difficult, especially because we found that there was no such thing as a “representative” country.

[Table A1 about here]

Table A1 presents three models with our country dummies with three different reference categories: model 1 has Canada as an average reference category (as the largest country with a mean the closest to the sample mean on our dependent variable), model 2 has Italy as a conservative reference category, and model 3 has Germany as a progressive reference category.

We could not get complete information about GDP in each country (communist countries being particularly problematic). Table A2 therefore presents our models identical to models 4 and 6 presented in table 3 but which control for GDP and moving to a poorer or richer country.

[Table A2 about here]

Controlling for GDP does change the significance of the moves in our religious regulation categories, but this is most likely due to the 400 cases eliminated when we control for GDP and moving in GDP.

Creating a Measure of Religious Regulation

As noted in the text, we suspected that the Council itself may have changed the Church’s evaluation of its relationship with the government in a variety of countries in our analysis. Indeed, as soon as we began inspecting earlier years of the NCAs, we noticed a clear trend: for eight of the nine countries in which Catholicism was noted as the state religion in 1955, the NCA did not mention the legal situation of the Church at all by 1965.

We therefore created our religious regulation variables from descriptions of the Church's legal situation in the 1955 NCA.¹⁰

We are confident that 1955 provides the best reflection of the legal situation of the Church in various countries of the world at the time of the Council.¹¹ We gave seven countries that did not yet exist or had no data in 1955 their score from the 1960 NCA:

¹⁰ We also entered the religious regulation variable for both 1965 and 1960 and checked them for consistency. Comparison of the 1955, 1960 and 1965 religious regulation variables demonstrated that the authors of the NCA seemed to have lost interest in the variable, except in relation those countries where it was persecuted (there was no change on the Church's assessment of its situation in communist countries). More than half of the countries in the database noted as having "constitutional freedom" in earlier years simply had no information about the legal situation of the Church by 1965 (n=77).

¹¹ Of the 29 countries that seemed to have real changes in the variable over the years (excluding those for which it simply disappeared), we did further research to assess whether these were real or simply an artifact of the NCA. Eight of these were countries with friendly state religions that went from being described as, for example, "Lutheranism is state religion, but all religions tolerated," to "constitutional freedom" to no mention at all. We left these with their coding from 1955. For those that had regime or boarder changes between 1955 and 1965, we used the relreg in the NCA closest to the regime change. For example, Cuba's Communist revolution ended in 1959, and was still not reflected in the 1960 NCA. We therefore coded it as communist from the next year from which we entered data, which was 1965, which noted that all religious schools had been "nationalized" (1965 NCA: 373). Syria's government seemed to have undergone real changes in its attitude toward the RCC, because it went from having a hostile, "anti-Catholic government" in 1955 (NCA: 109) to "Mohammedanism predominates, Church free" in 1961 (NCA: 355). We coded Syria as "State Religion non Roman Catholic, but no persecution noted" because that code more closely reflected the government's attitude at the time of the Council.

British Honduras, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Malaysia, Taiwan and Rwanda. 27 (18 percent) of the 152 countries in the database had no information for any of the years (most of them because they were not yet countries in 1955, when the Church was still actively gathering the information), or because the country's boundaries changed after 1955 making the data unusable.

Finally, there was one code in the NCA that presented us with a problem, since it seemed to be combining religious regulation and market share considerations by noting that "Catholicism predominates" a particular country. The four countries with this code in the 1955 NCA (Peru, the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Seychelles) were all described as having constitutional freedom by the 1960 NCA. Given the variety of choices offered by the NCA, this likely represented a situation with official constitutional freedom, but where defacto, the Church was given special status. We therefore coded them as having the RCC as the state religion. The remainder of the terms used to code the type of religious regulation in each country are provided below.

TERMS USED WHEN CODING RELIGIOUS REGULATION FROM THE 1955-1965 NCA

Catholicism is the state religion = 0

- Catholicism as state religion/church, but all religions tolerated
- Catholicism predominates, Church is partly state supported
- State recognizes and supports RCC, but permits free exercise of other religions
- RCC supported by the state, but all religions tolerated
- RCC has a "special place" in the constitution

Catholicism Predominates =1

- Predominately Catholic (this counts only if the NCA specifically says this and nothing else, we are not using percent Cath to code this). We are going to have to decide whether this should be a 0 or a missing.
- Catholicism is prevailing religion/ majority of population is Catholic

Religious Freedom = 2

- Constitutional freedom
- "Church Free"
- All religions guaranteed freedom under constitution

- All religions permitted in accordance with Toleration Act
- Freedom of worship is granted
- Liberty of conscience was granted
- Predominately Moslem inhabitants, but constitutional freedom of worship
- All religions tolerated in accordance with US constitution
- Missionary work
- No state religion/church, all religions tolerated
- Catholics form a small minority (and it doesn't say anything else)
- Church is showing rebirth (and it doesn't say anything else)
- Predominately Catholic, but all religions are free.

State religion is not RCC, but RCC is not persecuted = 3

- Lutheranism as state religion, but all religions tolerated
- Islam as state religion, but freedom of worship is granted
- Eastern Orthodox is state church, but constitutional religions toleration is est.
- Church of England is state church
- Buddhism is the State religion, but liberty of conscience is granted
- Predominately Presbyterian, small percentage Catholic
- Predominately Mohammedans, small percentage Catholic
- Catholicism not tolerated until 1792 (this is if it is a non-Catholic, but not communist country, if communist, then put under "persecuted").
- Any religion noted as the state religion, but Catholic missionary work is allowed or present.

Restricted Religious Freedom, Non-Communist Persecution or Hostility = 4

- All inhabitants subject to law of Islam; no priest may enter
- Majority of population Mohammedans, Catholicism persecuted
- Inhabitants predominately Sunni-Moslem, government is officially anti-Catholic
- Persecution greatly reduces Catholic population
- Missionary work not allowed (and it is not a communist country).
- Lutheranism is state church, toleration granted by constitutional amendment, but Society of Jesus is still prohibited
- Constitutional freedom, although restricted in some ways
- Constitutional freedom, but hindrances in educational, social or missionary work among natives.
- Notes unfriendly or hostile government or constitution – even if it isn't enforced.

Communist Persecution = 5

- Alleged constitutional freedom
- Alleged constitutional freedom but actual persecution
- Alleged constitutional freedom there but actual persecution, with missionaries under arrest and native clergy restricted
- Toleration granted, but RCC endures persecution
- Alleged constitutional freedom, but under Soviet occupation
- National Church (communist), freedom of worship was granted but RCC is imperiled by Communist Coup
- Communist control, status of RCC uncertain
- RCC suffers greatly under Communist government

- On paper, communist government recognizes religion/the church/papal jurisdiction in matters of religion, but agreement is often violated
- The Greek Orthodox Church is state religion, official status granted to Catholicism, but Greek Catholic bishops have been deported, expelled, forced to leave
- RCC persecuted by communists
- Russian Orthodox as prevailing religion, RCC endures persecution (if this is about a communist country, put here, if not, then put under option 5)
- Majority of inhabitants Serbia-Orthodox, under a communist government, RCC persecuted
- All religions persecuted
- Constitutional (or other) hostility toward the Church
- All religious orders prohibited, religions are persecuted, godless propaganda is encouraged

Table A1: OLS Regression of Bishops' Voting Scores on Bishops' Country of Service (N=2022)

	Canada as Reference	Italy as Reference	Germany as Reference
Algeria	12.341 (1.24)	41.644 (4.25)*	-0.584 (0.06)
Angola	-10.321 (1.56)	18.982 (2.98)**	-23.246 (3.53)**
Basutoland	11.675 (1.49)	40.977 (5.40)**	-1.251 (0.16)
Cameroon	5.048 (1.16)	34.350 (8.74)**	-7.878 (1.84)
Cape Verde Islands	-20.071 (8.99)**	9.231 (7.57)**	-32.997 (15.66)**
Congo, Dem. Rep.	17.257 (5.79)**	46.560 (20.05)**	4.332 (1.50)
Dahomey	14.691 (2.71)**	43.993 (8.65)**	1.765 (0.33)
Ethiopia	-16.807 (1.89)	12.495 (1.44)	-29.733 (3.36)**
Gabon	12.733 (3.03)**	42.036 (11.18)**	-0.193 (0.05)
Gambia	8.500 (3.81)**	37.803 (30.98)**	-4.425 (2.10)*
Ghana	7.359 (1.30)	36.662 (6.85)**	-5.566 (0.99)
Guinea	10.683 (1.11)	39.985 (4.25)**	-2.243 (0.23)
Ivory Coast	13.897 (3.68)**	43.200 (13.15)**	0.971 (0.26)
Kenya	-7.254 (0.93)	22.049 (2.91)**	-20.179 (2.60)**
Liberia	2.548 (0.26)	31.850 (3.32)**	-10.378 (1.06)
Libya	-34.357 (15.40)**	-5.054 (4.14)**	-47.283 (22.44)**
Madagascar	10.321 (3.17)**	39.623 (14.87)**	-2.605 (0.82)
Mauritius	-1.024 (0.46)	28.279 (23.18)**	-13.949 (6.62)**
Morocco	4.810 (0.46)	34.112 (3.29)**	-8.116 (0.77)
Mozambique	-13.286 (2.25)*	16.017 (2.86)**	-26.211 (4.47)**
Nigeria	-3.628 (0.69)	25.675 (5.19)**	-16.553 (3.16)**
Reunion	6.119 (0.50)	35.422 (2.91)**	-6.806 (0.55)
Rhodesia	0.881 (0.10)	30.184 (3.56)**	-12.045 (1.39)
Rwanda	17.310 (5.53)**	46.612 (18.56)**	4.384 (1.44)
Senegal	8.500 (3.81)**	37.803 (30.98)**	-4.425 (2.10)*
Seychelles	8.500	37.803	-4.425

	(3.81)**	(30.98)**	(2.10)*
Sierra Leone	-26.817	2.485	-39.743
	(10.09)**	(1.31)	(15.56)**
Somalia	-6.976	22.327	-19.902
	(0.86)	(2.83)**	(2.46)*
South Africa	6.035	35.338	-6.890
	(1.22)	(7.75)**	(1.41)
Sudan	-6.579	22.723	-19.505
	(1.42)	(5.38)**	(4.28)**
Swaziland	-61.024	-31.721	-73.949
	(27.35)**	(26.00)**	(35.09)**
Togo	5.326	34.628	-7.600
	(0.86)	(5.83)**	(1.23)
Tunisia	26.754	56.057	13.829
	(11.99)**	(45.94)**	(6.56)**
Uganda	5.667	34.969	-7.259
	(1.23)	(8.28)**	(1.59)
United Arab Republic	2.183	31.485	-10.743
	(0.41)	(6.29)**	(2.03)*
Zambia	13.932	43.235	1.007
	(2.60)**	(8.59)**	(0.19)
Ceylon	1.924	31.227	-11.001
	(0.22)	(3.73)**	(1.29)
East Timor	-28.801	0.501	-41.727
	(12.91)**	(0.41)	(19.80)**
Fiji Islands	23.976	53.279	11.051
	(10.74)**	(43.67)**	(5.24)**
India	-4.170	25.133	-17.095
	(1.25)	(9.10)**	(5.26)**
Indonesia	19.600	48.903	6.675
	(7.29)**	(25.27)**	(2.58)**
Iran	-15.838	13.464	-28.764
	(1.86)	(1.62)	(3.38)**
Iraq	-2.214	27.088	-15.140
	(0.31)	(3.99)**	(2.16)*
Israel	-56.579	-27.277	-69.505
	(25.36)**	(22.36)**	(32.99)**
Japan	1.939	31.242	-10.986
	(0.47)	(8.41)**	(2.68)**
South Korea	1.326	30.628	-11.600
	(0.22)	(5.28)**	(1.92)
Lebanon	4.273	33.575	-8.653
	(0.81)	(6.79)**	(1.65)
Malaysia	10.881	40.184	-2.045
	(1.67)	(6.43)**	(0.32)
New Caledonia	27.548	56.850	14.622
	(12.35)**	(46.59)**	(6.94)**
Papua New Guinea	10.246	39.549	-2.679
	(2.50)*	(10.86)**	(0.67)
Philippines	-1.309	27.994	-14.234
	(0.30)	(7.03)**	(3.28)**
Syria	-10.136	19.166	-23.062
	(1.34)	(2.62)**	(3.07)**
Taiwan	-3.405	25.898	-16.330
	(0.60)	(4.85)**	(2.91)**
Thailand	11.040	40.342	-1.886

Turkey	(2.95)** -1.288 (0.10)	(12.44)** 28.014 (2.26)*	(0.51) -14.214 (1.14)
Austria	7.621 (1.01)	36.923 (5.05)**	-5.305 (0.71)
Belgium	10.212 (1.88)	39.514 (7.75)**	-2.714 (0.50)
Cyprus	15.643 (7.01)**	44.946 (36.84)**	2.717 (1.29)
Denmark	21.199 (9.50)**	50.501 (41.39)**	8.273 (3.93)**
England	4.573 (1.04)	33.876 (8.56)**	-8.353 (1.94)
Finland	-0.230 (0.03)	29.073 (3.82)**	-13.156 (1.69)
France	12.703 (4.90)**	42.005 (23.37)**	-0.223 (0.09)
Greece	-3.291 (0.35)	26.011 (2.83)**	-16.217 (1.74)
Iceland	15.643 (7.01)**	44.946 (36.84)**	2.717 (1.29)
Ireland	-19.543 (4.18)**	9.759 (2.28)*	-32.469 (7.03)**
Luxembourg	21.199 (9.50)**	50.501 (41.39)**	8.273 (3.93)**
Malta	-20.071 (8.99)**	9.231 (7.57)**	-32.997 (15.66)**
Netherlands	7.662 (0.80)	36.965 (3.95)**	-5.263 (0.55)
Norway	11.318 (2.62)**	40.620 (10.42)**	-1.608 (0.38)
Poland	3.879 (0.81)	33.181 (7.47)**	-9.047 (1.90)
Portugal	-20.706 (5.25)**	8.596 (2.47)*	-33.632 (8.67)**
Scotland	3.738 (1.68)	33.041 (27.08)**	-9.187 (4.36)**
Spain	-22.138 (6.58)**	7.164 (2.56)*	-35.064 (10.68)**
Sweden	-1.024 (0.46)	28.279 (23.18)**	-13.949 (6.62)**
Switzerland	-5.151 (0.64)	24.152 (3.09)**	-18.076 (2.26)*
Yugoslavia	-5.769 (1.15)	23.534 (5.06)**	-18.695 (3.77)**
East Germany	23.381 (10.29)**	52.684 (40.69)**	10.455 (4.86)**
North Ireland	-4.595 (0.64)	24.707 (3.58)**	-17.521 (2.46)*
Argentina	-7.608 (1.86)	21.695 (5.95)**	-20.534 (5.09)**
Bahamas	13.262 (5.94)**	42.565 (34.89)**	0.336 (0.16)
Bolivia	-2.047 (0.33)	27.255 (4.54)**	-14.973 (2.40)*
Brazil	-3.346	25.957	-16.271

	(1.12)	(11.13)**	(5.62)**
British Guiana	-20.071	9.231	-32.997
	(8.99)**	(7.57)**	(15.66)**
British Honduras	-5.786	23.517	-18.711
	(2.59)**	(19.27)**	(8.88)**
Chile	4.630	33.932	-8.296
	(0.90)	(7.04)**	(1.62)
Colombia	-6.817	22.485	-19.743
	(1.81)	(6.87)**	(5.34)**
Costa Rica	-11.817	17.485	-24.743
	(0.99)	(1.49)	(2.09)*
Cuba	-7.770	21.533	-20.695
	(1.23)	(3.57)**	(3.30)**
Dominican Republic	0.828	30.131	-12.097
	(0.09)	(3.16)**	(1.25)
Ecuador	-8.065	21.237	-20.991
	(1.41)	(3.94)**	(3.71)**
El Salvador	-16.301	13.001	-29.227
	(1.94)	(1.58)	(3.49)**
Guadeloupe & Martinique	-9.119	20.184	-22.045
	(3.70)**	(12.59)**	(9.38)**
Guatemala	-24.927	4.376	-37.853
	(4.53)**	(0.85)	(6.95)**
Haiti	9.849	39.152	-3.076
	(2.34)*	(10.36)**	(0.74)
Honduras	-11.817	17.485	-24.743
	(1.52)	(2.32)*	(3.20)**
Mexico	-9.813	19.489	-22.739
	(2.71)**	(6.27)**	(6.40)**
Nicaragua	-8.061	21.242	-20.986
	(1.21)	(3.32)**	(3.17)**
Panama	-5.653	23.649	-18.579
	(0.48)	(2.04)*	(1.58)
Paraguay	1.556	30.858	-11.370
	(0.21)	(4.33)**	(1.55)
Peru	-7.520	21.783	-20.445
	(1.48)	(4.61)**	(4.07)**
Puerto Rico	7.310	36.612	-5.616
	(3.28)**	(30.01)**	(2.67)**
Uruguay	8.825	38.127	-4.101
	(1.77)	(8.22)**	(0.83)
Venezuela	-0.054	29.249	-12.979
	(0.01)	(5.56)**	(2.34)*
Surinam	8.500	37.803	-4.425
	(3.81)**	(30.98)**	(2.10)*
French Guiana	7.310	36.612	-5.616
	(3.28)**	(30.01)**	(2.67)**
United States	1.432	30.734	-11.494
	(0.52)	(15.03)**	(4.30)**
Australia	-7.502	21.801	-20.427
	(1.78)	(5.75)**	(4.91)**
New Zealand	9.393	38.696	-3.533
	(0.71)	(2.96)**	(0.27)
West Germany	12.926	42.228	
	(4.21)**	(17.34)**	
Italy	-29.302		-42.228

Canada	(11.52)**	29.302	(17.34)**
		(11.52)**	-12.926
Constant	67.690	38.388	(4.21)**
	(30.33)**	(31.46)**	80.616
R-squared	0.34	0.34	(38.26)**
			0.34

* p< 0.05; **p< 0.01. Robust t-values are in parentheses.

Table A2: Models 4 and 6 With GDP

	Model 1	Model 2
Observations	1756	1645
Roman Curia	-5.428 (2.30) *	-5.970 (2.69)**
Signed Communism Petition	-9.608 (6.76)**	-8.201 (5.60)**
Member of Domus Mariae	17.065 (5.63)**	17.203 (5.80)**
Member of the SCU	10.921 (2.47)*	9.727 (2.12)*
Age	-0.335 (6.17)**	-0.394 (7.20)**
Percent of Country who are members of Roman Curia	-0.230 (2.66)**	-0.096 (0.75)
Percent of Country who signed Communism Petition	-0.349 (6.70)**	-0.348 (5.27)**
Bishop's Country had DM Representative	6.384 (2.69)**	19.227 (6.58)**
Percent of Country who are members of the SCU	0.530 (2.07)*	1.177 (2.37)*
Country's Mean Age	0.602 (3.46)**	0.600 (3.02)**
Percent Catholic (PC)	-1.262 (4.49)**	-0.545 (1.98)*
Religious Freedom ^a	-105.429 (4.04)**	-48.399 (1.90)
State is Hostile	-104.965 (3.95)**	-48.971 (1.82)
State Religion Not RCC	-101.544 (3.81)**	-33.486 (1.30)
Communist Persecution	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Interaction: Religious Freedom and PC	1.248 (4.41)**	0.608 (2.20)*
Interaction: State is Hostile and PC	1.148 (3.95)**	0.505 (1.71)
Interaction: State Religion not RCC and PC	0.548 (0.55)	-0.513 (0.42)
Interaction: Communist and PC	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Logged GDP	-1.575 (4.90)**	-1.037 (2.56)*
<i><u>Moving Variables:</u></i>		
Moved to an Older Country		-0.766 (1.60)
Moved to a Younger Country		0.561 (1.62)
Moved to a Country with more Roman Curia		-0.470 (2.54)*
Moved to a Country with less Roman Curia		0.148 (0.79)
Moved to a Country with more Petition Signers		0.338

		(3 . 13) **
Moved to a Country with less Petition Signers		-0 . 722
		(2 . 79) **
Moved to a Country with a DM Rep		-24 . 043
		(5 . 07) **
Moved to a Country without a DM Rep		17 . 844
		(4 . 29) **
Moved to a Country with more SCU Members		-0 . 916
		(1 . 48)
Moved to a Country with less SCU Members		0 . 524
		(1 . 02)
Moved to a Country w/ a Lower Percent Catholic		0 . 104
		(2 . 76) **
Moved to a Country w/ a Higher Percent Catholic		-0 . 085
		(1 . 17)
RCC State Religion in Country of Origin, Religious Freedom in Country of Service ^b		0 . 576
		(0 . 14)
Religious Freedom in Country of Origin, RCC is State Religion in Country of Service		0 . 758
		(0 . 17)
Other State Religion in Country of Origin, RCC is State Religion in Country of Service		0 . 000
		(.)
Other State Religion in Country of Origin, Religious Freedom in Country of Service		30 . 439
		(2 . 62) **
Communist Country of Origin, Other State Religion in Country of Service		0 . 000
		(.)
Moved to a Country w/ a Higher GDP		-1 . 117
		(0 . 68)
Moved to a Country w/ a Lower GDP		0 . 021
		(0 . 04)
Constant	213 . 637	135 . 640
	(7 . 75) **	(4 . 96) **
R-squared	0 . 32	0 . 41

* p< 0.05; **p< 0.01. Robust t-values are in parentheses.

^a Countries where the RCC is the state religion is the reference category for all of the religious regulation variables and the interactions with percent Catholic.

^b Bishops who did not move, or whose religious regulation did not change are the reference category for all religious regulation moves.