

RELIGIOUS COERCION · CAPTIVE AUDIENCE · CONSENT · DISAFFILIATION · CHRISTIAN
NATIONALISM · PUBLIC EDUCATION · THE UNAFFILIATED · ETHICS OF PERSUASION

The Captive Classroom

Coercion, Consent, and the Manufacture of Belief, why a mandate to compel scripture fails on moral, scriptural, and empirical grounds simultaneously.

SAME COALITION, OUT-GROUP CONTENT

Books featuring LGBT characters in elementary school

Framed as *indoctrination*. Parental rights invoked to remove children from the lesson. Secured a constitutional exit right in *Mahmoud v. Taylor* (2025).

SAME COALITION, IN-GROUP CONTENT

Biblical scripture mandated for 5 million students in every grade

Framed as *education, heritage, character*. Parental rights forgotten. Objecting families become the obstacle.

The act is the same in both cases: the state places content before a captive child as part of the required curriculum. What flips is not the act. What flips is whose content it is.

No rule survives the swap of content.

There is no formulation of the indoctrination objection or the parental-rights claim, as the coalition deploys them, that condemns the storybooks without also condemning the scripture mandate. The coalition condemns only one. The categories do not name a principle about compulsory instruction. Each names a side.

WHAT "INDOCTRINATION" MEANS, AS USED

Compulsory exposure to ideas the speaker dislikes.

WHAT "PARENTAL RIGHTS" MEANS, AS USED

The right of parents who agree with the speaker to get their way.

Persuasion **vs.** Coercion

The difference is not degree. It is exit.

Persuasion addresses a listener who remains free to disagree and to leave. Coercion holds the listener in place. The distinction does not turn on the content of the message. It turns on whether the audience can refuse it.



A society may permit vigorous, even offensive persuasion precisely because the exit stays open.

The book that can be closed and the debate that can be walked out of are paradigm cases of the persuasion form. When the most visible movement of public atheism reached its height, it operated entirely this way. Whatever one thinks of its content or tone, it never conscripted anyone.

NEW ATHEISM (2000S)

Books, debates, arguments.
Exit always open.

SCRIPTURE MANDATE (2026)

A statute. Exit closed by law.

One side wrote books that could be declined. The other passes laws that cannot.

To place the scripture of one faith before a captive audience as required instruction is not to persuade them. It is to use their captivity.

Required by law to attend

Compulsory attendance makes them captive before the content question even arises.

Young and dependent

Developmentally disposed to accept what authority presents as curriculum.

Cannot leave the room

The book cannot be closed. The lesson cannot be walked out of. The exit is structural.

Court-recognized

Lee v. Weisman (1992): even subtle pressure in schools carries unusual coercive force precisely because attendance is compelled.

The mandate assumes non-belief is an empty vessel. That picture is wrong, and its wrongness is the seed of its failure.

A position reached by a route is not a vacancy. Coercion supplies a reason to resist that the prior absence of conviction did not contain. To treat the unaffiliated as empty is to misread them, and to act on the misreading is to convert indifference into objection.

THE VACANCY PICTURE

Non-belief is an emptiness. Exposure produces belief. The undecided are available to be filled.

THE REALITY

A position reached is not a vacancy. Compulsion hardens it. This is the mechanism by which the mandate defeats itself.

The Scripture Argument

The text does not command compulsion. It commands persuasion.

The mandate's defenders invoke the authority of scripture. That authority, examined honestly, runs the other direction. The compulsion is not in the text, and in several places the text is against it.



The Ten Commandments Cover worship, the divine name, the sabbath, parents, killing, adultery, theft, false witness, and coveting. **Not one commands a believer to compel scripture upon those who do not want it.**

Matthew 28:19–20 The Great Commission is an instruction to preach, teach, and baptize those who come, an instruction to **persuade**. It does not authorize legislating or conscripting a captive audience. The distance between making a disciple and conscripting a captive is the entire distance between persuasion and coercion.

Romans 13:1 Instructs the believer to be subject to the governing authorities. A movement that defies civil injunctions to install its scripture in the schools is not following the scripture it claims to follow. The scripture supplies the opposite counsel.

Because the compulsion is absent from the scripture and in tension with it, its source must be sought elsewhere. The elsewhere is politics.

The use of state power to establish the cultural dominance of one faith is the definition of Christian nationalism, and not of Christianity. The two are distinct, and the data bear this out: the political force of Christian nationalist sentiment is strongest among those who do not attend religious services. It travels as a political identity rather than a devotional one.

You do not compel what you can convince. Reaching for compulsion concedes that persuasion has failed.

The Empirical Record

What the data say the mandate will actually do.

The mandate arrives during a sustained decline in Christian adherence. The sociology of that decline shows that the mandate is not just ineffective; it is an accelerant of the very process it aims to reverse.



78%
Christian, 2007

62%
Christian, 2024

29%

of American adults now unaffiliated, up from single digits a generation ago.

43%

of the youngest cohort are unaffiliated. Fewer than half identify as Christian.

19%

of all adults answer "nothing in particular", the soft middle the mandate is aimed at. They are the mandate's target, and the most likely to harden on contact.

The causal arrow runs from coercive politics to religious disaffiliation.

Hout & Fischer (2002, 2014) Rise of the nones is concentrated among moderates and liberals: symbolic withdrawal from a religion publicly identified with conservative politics.

Campbell et al. (2018) Experimental and panel data: expose subjects to the association between religion and conservative Republican politics, and they become measurably more likely to disclaim religious affiliation.

Djupe et al. (2018) State-level bans on same-sex marriage: associated with the disaffiliation of an estimated **2–8% of the population over a decade**. A single coercive campaign, measured.

The sharpest costs fall on the children who are most captive and least able to refuse.

Instructional time is finite. Every inclusion displaces something else. The displacement does not fall evenly, it concentrates on students who depend most on specialized supports and individualized instruction, for whom each unit of instructional time is most scarce and most consequential.

WHAT THE MANDATE TRANSFERS

A unit of scarce instructional time, away from the students who depend on it most, and toward content they did not choose and that serves a purpose unrelated to their educational need.

This is the recurring signature of the enterprise: its costs concentrate on those least able to bear them.

— IN CONCLUSION

You do not compel what you can convince, and you do not draft a captive audience when a willing one is available. There is no willing one. That is the whole story, and the mandate is its confession.

Its categories are tribal markers, not principles. Its method, coercing a captive audience, is the one method that cannot produce genuine belief.

Its source is not in the scripture it compels. Its effect is to accelerate the disaffiliation it means to reverse, at the expense of those least able to refuse it.

SOURCES Gilly, *The Captive Classroom* (2026), sec. VIII.

Gilly, T. (2026). *The Captive Classroom: Coercion, Consent, and the Manufacture of Belief*. Real Safety AI Foundation, working paper (v2).

Abington School District v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963).

Burge, R. P. (2023). *The nones: Where they came from, who they are, and where they are going* (2nd ed.). Fortress Press.

Campbell, D. E., Layman, G. C., Green, J. C., & Sumaktoyo, N. G. (2018). Putting politics first: The impact of politics on American religious and secular orientations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 62(3), 551–565. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12365>

Congressional Research Service. (2025). *Free exercise of religion at school: The Supreme Court’s Mahmoud v. Taylor ruling* (LSB11360).

Cooper, B., Cox, D., Lienesch, R., & Jones, R. P. (2016). *Exodus: Why Americans are leaving religion—and why they’re unlikely to come back*. Public Religion Research Institute.

Djupe, P. A., Neiheisel, J. R., & Conger, K. H. (2018). Are the politics of the Christian right linked to state rates of the nonreligious? The importance of salient controversy. *Political Research Quarterly*, 71(4), 910–922.

Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962).

Gorski, P. S., & Perry, S. L. (2022). *The flag and the cross: White Christian nationalism and the threat to American democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Hout, M., & Fischer, C. S. (2002). Why more Americans have no religious preference: Politics and generations. *American Sociological Review*, 67(2), 165–190.

Hout, M., & Fischer, C. S. (2014). Explaining why more Americans have no religious preference: Political backlash and generational succession, 1987–2012. *Sociological Science*, 1, 423–447. <https://doi.org/10.15195/v1.a24>

Lee v. Weisman, 505 U.S. 577 (1992).

Lim, C., MacGregor, C. A., & Putnam, R. D. (2010). Secular and liminal: Discovering heterogeneity among religious nones. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 49(4), 596–618. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2010.01533.x>

Mahmoud v. Taylor, 606 U.S. 522 (2025).

Margolis, M. F. (2018). *From politics to the pews: How partisanship and the political environment shape religious identity*. University of Chicago Press.

Pew Research Center. (2025, February 26). *Decline of Christianity in the U.S. has slowed, may have leveled off* (2023–24 Religious Landscape Study).

Putnam, R. D., & Campbell, D. E. (2010). *American grace: How religion divides and unites us*. Simon & Schuster.

Schwadel, P. (2020). The politics of religious nones. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 59(1), 180–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jssr.12640>

Stroope, S., Froese, P., Rackin, H. M., & Delehanty, J. (2021). Unchurched Christian nationalism and the 2016 U.S. presidential election. *Sociological Forum*, 36(2), 405–425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12684>

Whitehead, A. L., & Perry, S. L. (2020). *Taking America back for God: Christian nationalism in the United States*. Oxford University Press.

Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972).