

Précis

A Proposal for a Proportional Accommodation and Appreciation Model For Governing the Relationship of Church and State

The Oxford Round Table
Religion and Science:
Shaping the Modern World

Presented by Ronnie W. Rogers
July 25 to July 30, 2010

To The Oxford Round Table
Harris Manchester College
The University of Oxford
Oxford England

© 2010
Ronnie W. Rogers

INTRODUCTION

This paper's objective is to demonstrate that the Proportional Accommodation and Appreciation (PAA) model of Church and State relationship is constitutionally, morally, and intellectually preferable to the Separation model.

The Separation model necessarily expands science beyond its legitimate domanical authority, thereby conflating science and naturalism as the supreme arbiter of the public domain.

THE PROPORTIONAL ACCOMMODATION AND APPRECIATION MODEL OF CHURCH AND STATE RELATIONSHIP

Accommodation ensures the free expression¹ of *all* religious and non-religious opinions in public life.²

Appreciation celebrates religious³ as well as non-religious beliefs and contributions.⁴

Proportionality modifies both accommodation⁵ and appreciation.

Scientific Liberal Culture (SLC)

Scientific Liberal (SL):⁶

First, science is the sufficient or supreme guide for how and what society and government should do or be.⁷ *Second*, change is generally viewed as good, and anything can and maybe *should* change provided there is enough scientific support.⁸ *Third*, one's behavior or beliefs indicate that science is the *only* or *supreme* publicly imposable guide⁹ in all areas of public life.¹⁰

An SLC is one where truth, morality, normal and abnormal, and what is suitable for politics, education, and public policy are ostensibly determined by science.¹¹

THE PAA MODEL IS MORALLY PREFERABLE

It encourages free expression of opinions by religious and non-religious citizens in every area of society.¹²

It avoids the need for illegitimate federal mandates or restrictions by recognizing the jurisdictional prohibition of such as intended by the First Amendment.¹³

It avoids the potential of federal endorsement of a particular worldview or ideology, whether such endorsement is by fiat or default.¹⁴

It is consistent with most religions and true science; the conflict is usually not between religion and science, but religion and scientism.¹⁵

THE MORAL ARGUMENT

The problem is that secularists often seek to summarily dismiss religious arguments from the public square via an extreme “separationist” interpretation of the First Amendment.¹⁶

For example, regarding the *Human Life Bill* “a question to which science can provide no answer...Defining the time at which the developing embryo becomes a person must remain a matter of moral or religious¹⁷ value.”¹⁸

“Is it moral and rational to exclude religious opinions from our republic or democratic public square just because those opinions involve an aspect of faith—a faith assumption?”

1. Everyone believes some unproven assumptions¹⁹

Einstein said, “To the sphere of religion belongs the faith that the regulations valid for the world of existence are rational, that is comprehensible to reason. I cannot conceive of a genuine scientist without that profound faith.”²⁰

The very founding of the United States was premised upon the rational and yet unprovable assumption of God,²¹ without which America²² would not exist.²³

2. Both secularism and supernaturalism are worldviews²⁴

Both encompass the “Three primary areas (the nature of reality, the nature of the human person,²⁵ the nature of moral and political values).”²⁶

3. Everyone argues from a worldview

One example is appropriate speed limits.²⁷

4. Suitable publicly debatable ideas need only to provide some publicly accessible rational evidence²⁸

The existence of God provides one example.²⁹

While beliefs solely drawn from a religion’s authoritative text may not be imposed upon non-adherents, these beliefs still have public debate appropriateness.³⁰

A. If some or all of the citizens believe in the same faith, or a particular candidate espouses his worldview or religion, these become topics appropriate for public discussion.

B. Some beliefs about right and wrong are not merely personal.³¹

5. The source of an idea is not sufficient cause for aprioristic exclusion from public debate³²

6. Associated faith assumptions do not disqualify all associated beliefs³³

7. Faith cannot truly be excluded from the marketplace of ideas³⁴

CONCLUSIONS

- An SLC requires expanding science beyond its domanical authority, thereby de jure stealthily enthroning naturalism/materialism as the national religion.
- An SLC denigrates man by defining him reductively according to Darwinism.³⁵
- The true exchange in the marketplace of imposable ideas is not science instead of religion, but Darwinian naturalism instead of supernatural religion.
- The Proportional Accommodation and Appreciation model results in a free and unshackled public square where the atheist, scientist, naturalist, religionist, and Christian are free to articulate their opinions.³⁶

Therefore, the United States government must return to being the securer of God-given unalienable endowments where science has a part, but so does the unfettered religious faith of “we the people” as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and forever protected in the Bill of Rights.

¹ This would be done through a jurisdictional understanding of the First Amendment, which accommodates at the federal level and leaves the rest to state and local communities. Some restrictions would naturally apply when such expression potentiates endangering others or so severely hinders the activity to make religious expression implausible. For example, wearing certain clothing or jewelry that places a soldier or fellow soldiers at unnecessary risk. However, these exceptions are not to be arbitrarily and/or unilaterally expanded to include inconvenient, annoying, or even “offensive.”

² Accommodation on the federal level is protected by the First Amendment, and expression on the local level is protected by that and the fact that since the adoption of the Constitution until recently, states and local governments were able to freely reflect the local religious sentiment. As Jefferson declared, “In matters of religion I have considered that its free exercise is placed by the Constitution *independent* of the power of the *General Government*. I have therefore *undertaken on no occasion to prescribe the religious exercises* suited to it, but have left them, as the Constitution found them, *under the direction and discipline of the church or state authorities.*” (italics added)

³ For example, education cannot be based upon science without invoking naturalism because science proper is an inadequate basis for state education. This is because science proper can only address physical nature, and interactions and relationships of physical properties, and education is much more than that. Education must and does address questions regarding life, living, morals, why, why am I here, where did I come from, where am I going, importance of life, and these are by their very nature beyond the pale of science.

⁴ In contrast, the Separation model devalues and denigrates religion by marginalizing its presence and influence, virtually excluding its undeniable and Brobdingnagian contribution in the past and present. Patrick Fagan sources numerous studies that corroborate the benefits of religion in a person’s life. Some of them deal specifically with the positive impact from church attendance on different areas of life. Religion has positive results in the areas of happiness, sense of well-being, lowering stress, better personal relationships, greater sexual satisfaction for women, lower risk of cardiovascular diseases, longer life for the poor; it affects blood pressure and different cancers; decreases illegitimacy, crime, delinquency, welfare dependency, alcohol and drug abuse, depression, suicide and enhances general overall mental, physical and social well-being. Patrick F. Fagan, “Why Religion Matters: The Impact of Religious Practice on Social Stability”, *The Heritage Foundation*, No. 1064, January 25, 1996, 5-20, available online at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Religion/BG1064.cfm>.

The empirical evidence attests to the importance of religion in people’s lives today. Gallup polls indicate that 83% of Americans identify themselves as Christian, 2% as Jewish and only 10% say “they have no

specific religious preference.” Joseph Carroll, “American Public Opinion About Religion”, The Gallup Organization, March 2, 2004, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/focus/sr040302.asp>.

This makes the religious viewpoint in general and Christianity in particular the dominant worldview of the United States. The poll says, “...roughly 6 in 10 Americans say that religion is very important in their personal lives. Carroll, ‘American Public Opinion.’ “An additional 24% say that religion is fairly important, and 15% say it is not very important. The importance of religion to Americans has remained quite stable over the past decade, with a low of 57% saying religion was very important in 1996 and a high of 61% saying it was very important in 1998.” The younger the population, the less important religion is to their lives, which I would attribute much to the influence of secular education.

Patrick Fagan notes, “The overall impact of religious practice is illustrated dramatically in the three most comprehensive systematic reviews of the field. Some 81 percent of the studies showed the positive benefit of religious practice, 15 percent showed neutral effects, and only 4 percent showed harm.” Fagan, “Why Religion Matters”, 2-3.

⁵ Proportionality addresses a common argument against accommodation, which is framed something like this: if we open up the public square to free religious expression, then we have to give every religion equal time or representation including Satanism, voodooism, witchcraft, Taoism, Zoroastrianism...and every other religion, which makes accommodation unfeasible in a pluralistic society.

However the idea of “proportionality” resolves this dilemma far more equitably and consistently with the First Amendment and states’ rights than the Separation model, which creates a religious apartheid by necessarily ensconcing secularism’s supremacy over the public square by government fiat.

⁶ My definition of liberal is not to be understood as the only definition because I do distinguish between liberal and conservative politics, liberal and conservative Christians, etc. But this is how I am using it in this paper...a person may claim to be a conservative or liberal Christian, secularist, New Ager, etc., but he can be a scientific liberal in that he views science as described in this paper.

⁷ For example, if one is satisfied with the present philosophy of public education, which is progressivism, a science-based education, then he is a scientific liberal even if he is unaware of it. With the transmogrification of public education from classical to progressive, science became the guardian of what is suitable for public education, and is now, in many areas, virtually indistinguishable from naturalism in public education.

⁸ President Obama issued an executive order lifting limits on federal funding for embryonic stem-cell research, which illustrates his elevation of science as the supreme guide of his administration. The President explained that: “This Order is an important step in advancing the cause of science in America. But let’s be clear: promoting science isn’t just about, providing resources - it is also about protecting free and open inquiry. It is about letting scientists like those here today do their jobs, free from manipulation or coercion, and listening to what they tell us, even when it’s inconvenient - especially when it’s inconvenient. It is about ensuring that scientific data is never distorted or concealed to serve a political agenda - and *that we make scientific decisions based on facts, not ideology.*”

“By doing this, we will ensure America’s continued global leadership in scientific discoveries and technological breakthroughs. That is essential not only for our economic prosperity, but for the progress of all humanity.

“That is why today, I am also signing a Presidential Memorandum directing the head of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy to develop a strategy for restoring scientific integrity to government decision making. *To ensure that in this new Administration, we base our public policies on the soundest science; that we appoint scientific advisors based on their credentials and experience, not their politics or ideology; and that we are open and honest with the American people about the science behind our decisions.* That is how we will harness the power of science to achieve our goals - to preserve our environment and protect our national security; to create the jobs of the future, and live longer, healthier lives.” (italics added) <http://my.barackobama.com/page/community/post/obamaforamerica/gGxNCf>, accessed 12/10/09.

Those of us who are not scientific liberals are open to considering the science related to issues, but unlike a scientific liberal like President Obama, we are unwilling to grant that science does not have its own bias (ideology), and that science *alone* can answer the most pressing questions concerning human life. He has allowed science and science *alone* to define human life, which is the quintessential characteristic of a SL.

⁹ For example, studies, polls, and experiments that show homosexuals, singles, and divorced families are equally healthy environments for child-rearing as monogamous marriages would have an influence upon

the values of a scientific liberal; whereas, it would not upon a non-scientific liberal because his view would be based on Scripture or something other than the latest scientific finding. One does not have to be a consistent scientific liberal to be a scientific liberal anymore than one has to be one hundred percent consistent with the teachings of Christ to be considered a Christian. Of course, in practical terms, a scientific liberal treats science as absolute even though it is intrinsically relative. In addition, this is not to say that a non-scientific liberal does not value science and even concur with science, but in contradistinction to a scientific liberal, a non-scientific liberal limits the domain and prestige of science to the empirical and does not limit what is knowable or publically imposable to the empirical.

¹⁰ Some SLs could be further classified as humanist, atheist, secularist, etc. However, a SL, as I am defining him, may also claim or be a person of faith in something more than nature. Usually, he views his faith as very personal or even private. The criterion for determining whether or not a person is a SL is not based upon whether he is an avowed atheist, secularist, or political or theological liberal. Rather it is determined by whether his thinking processes and determinations are either supremely guided or governed by scientific polls, studies, or the most recent experiment. Add to that the idea that his faith is not merely personal but private and therefore may have little obvious influence upon him; therefore, it should not exert influence upon anyone else nor should anyone else's faith exert influence upon him. He recognizes that faith is something, but not much of something beyond a private affection. This recognition may be evidenced by his actions in spite of his feelings, words, or even desires to the contrary.

A SL may be immoral or moral, lazy or hardworking, married or single, and he may even hold many of the same values that the Bible teaches. However, the distinguishing mark is that these values are merely personal, convenient, or coincidental because what actually molds a liberal is science and/or naturalism. Consequently, a liberal may be considered "spiritual" in some respects, but his guiding light is science and everything is open-ended.

A SL, in the sense that I have defined, is a relativist, but his relativism is not a technical or a developed philosophical relativism; it is the fruition of his faith in science to guide culture. Remember that science is open-ended; everything is an experiment, i.e. relative. Therefore, he may be very much at peace with what seems to the philosopher to be an inchoate relativism.

¹¹ This is because true science is limited to the study of the physical nature, relationships, and interactions of physical phenomena. Scientific thinking becomes the process for objectively knowing. Scientific liberal culture seeks to explain or justify everything scientifically, which necessarily results in culture operating according to naturalism since true science is too limited. Reductively describing humans as being merely physical is beyond the scope of science and is therefore a philosophical or religious assessment. Even the premise that what can be known about humans physically is what is in fact true about humans is not a scientific statement, but rather a philosophical one. A culture dominated *solely* by secular or scientific thinking will ultimately privatize faith by banishing the supernatural to myths, fairytales, and legend, or being publicly illegal although it may recognize some psychological value in man's evolution. That we are inexorably headed in this direction is evidenced by the heretofore unstoppable removal of God from public education and policy debate. To put it another way, an individual *can at times* be permitted to publically express his personal faith, or tenets of his faith, but such expressions have no value or place in establishing public policy because it is not imposable knowledge, whereas that which is labeled "science" is.

¹² And this without government restriction or endorsement, as is clearly the intent of the First Amendment.

¹³ Free expression of state, community, and personal opinions and values are restored without interference of the federal government.

¹⁴ The federal government can by *ukase* declare a national religion, which it is explicitly prohibited from doing, or it can establish one *consequently* by eliminating all biases but one from the underpinnings of public education and policy debate, but either way the First Amendment is violated.

¹⁵ Scientism—naturalism—defines reality as the sum of physical properties and possibly epiphenomena. The PAA model engenders an enlightened public square characterized by a robust scientific enterprise, unlimited multiplicity of intellectual arguments, challenges from the past and present experience of man, and unfettered religious expression. All biases are scrutinized equally. The validity and acceptability of proposed ideas are assured because they are exposed to the scrutiny of contrary evidence, and science's claims of objectivity are more easily evaluated and demonstrated.

¹⁶ They advert to generally any idea as religious that is in some way associated with supernatural religion or not derived from secularism. In practical terms, this simply means that an opinion is determined to be religious and therefore unworthy of public policy because it is either a part of a religious worldview, is

derived from one's religion, there is an element of faith involved, it is partly based on religion, it is merely consonant with religion, the argument has religious implications, or many times simply because the person arguing for a contrary view is a Christian. Like biologist Paul Gross who "derides scholars critical of neo-Darwinism as 'crackpots,' 'bogus scientists,' or 'scientific illiterates' who are driven by religious fanaticism and who are part of a 'vast right-wing conspiracy' against the separation of church and state."

¹⁷ Scientists, secularists, began to respond like one professor who argued, "As a citizen I find it abhorrent to contemplate the force of law being given to one set of religious beliefs." Robert H. Ebert as quoted by West, *Darwin Day*, 334.

¹⁸ Cited in the testimony of Dr. Lewis Thomas in the 1980s, *The Human Life Bill*, 74, as quoted by West, *Darwin Day*, 333.

¹⁹ Even the idea that the public square should be limited to what can be demonstrated by science, or that science should trump all other arguments including the religious just because it is science, is not a scientific concept. Scientists often make claims such as, "the process of evolution is blind, mechanistic, purposeless, goalless, unplanned, and completely natural and material." That may or may not be true, but what is absolutely true is that it is a faith assumption because it cannot be proven.

²⁰ Cox, *Tyranny*, 334.

²¹ Every worldview bases some of its ideas on faith; ideas that cannot be proven now or may never be, but arguments only need to be rational, not proven; at the heart of this issue is the existence of God. His existence cannot be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt, but neither can His non-existence. A state that values the reality of the immaterial world assumes His existence, as is demonstrably true in America, whereas a purely secular state, like the Soviet Union, China... assumes that He does not exist. Neither can be proven, but both have comprehensive and profound political and social consequences.

²² The U.S. Constitution exempts Sundays from legislative work, Art. I, Sec. 7, which is why the U. S. Capitol building was available for church on Sundays; and this recognition of a Christian Sabbath in the U.S. Constitution was cited by federal courts as proof of the Christian nature of America.

²³ Thus, it seems preposterous to assume that the Founders would smile upon our political, educational, and societal compartmentalization of religion and its concomitant hostility toward Christianity in today's America. Therefore, since everyone argues from some unprovable assumptions, and our founding documents are premised upon the existence of God and they guarantee protection of that belief to be freely expressed in religious opinions both in private and public debate, it is to be particularly valued and protected.

²⁴ For supernaturalism, it is that God exists; and for secularism it is that God does not exist or is not knowable, or that secularism is the best way to address human concerns or needs. Since both worldviews address questions, either explicitly or implicitly, like where did we come from (big bang or God), why are we here (no teleological reason or to serve God), what is our problem (religion or sin), what is the essential solution to the problem (education or education and repentance) and where are we going (nowhere, we don't know, or to heaven or hell), are humans valuable (based upon evolutionary level, a certain quality, or created in the image of God)? Regardless of the answers to such questions, they have potential public impact, they are unprovable at the present and therefore require faith from which we formulate values, impossible values, and other ideas. See other places in the full paper where religion is defined to include both natural and supernatural faiths and as a worldview

²⁵ This question is at the heart of the abortion debate. Christians asseverate that human life begins at conception and is intrinsically valuable, whereas abortionists often base their views of abortion on evolution or Darwinism. "Ohio surgeon George Crile argued that the determination of when human life begins should be answered 'through the eyes of Darwin and evolution.'" Wells, *Darwin Day*, 329. Also a letter citing Haeckel's work to justify abortion to the U.S. Senate, (Letter from Milan M. Vuitch to Senator John East, April 22, 1981, in the Human Life Bill Appendix: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Ninety-seventh Congress, first session on S. 158, a Bill to Provide that Human Life Shall be Deemed to Exist from Conception, April 23; May 20,21; June 1, 10, 12, and 18. Serial No. J-97-16 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982), 105 as quoted by Wells, *Politically Incorrect Guide*, 163.) The same could be said about racism, eugenics (Wells, *Politically Incorrect Guide*, 162-163) although others justified the same on different grounds.

²⁶ Sweetman, *Politics Needs Religion*, 77.

²⁷ Both secularists and “traditional religions” rely on arguments that contain varying degrees of faith in such things as unproven assumptions, an authority, process, or tradition.

²⁸ This evidence can be empirical, logical, historical, philosophical, religious, or drawn from human experience.

²⁹ However, even a belief derived exclusively from the Bible does not make it irrational—internally contradictory or not held by reasonable people—but rather that it is knowable by faith alone. Further, just because a belief is a part of a religious worldview—belief in God, marriage between a man and a woman, absolute truth, homosexuality is abnormal, stealing is wrong—does not thereby exclude it from being argued and considered in public debate or education any more than beliefs of the secularist are off limits because they are a part of his worldview, which contains faith or religious beliefs, e.g. morals are relative, big bang, matter is all there is, science can tell us all there is to know or can be known, there is a scientific answer to the origin of the universe, appeals to secular liberal tradition, or that humans are not different in kind from animals, etc.

³⁰ In the paper are three more:

Third, it is always appropriate for someone to argue a position drawn from or consistent with his deeply held faith, and to not do so is irrational.

Fourth, religion, worldviews, or “faiths” do not exist exclusively in the private world of an individual, and to require such is to require what is extraordinarily unreasonable.

Fifth, if it is something that any free and equal person could be conceived of as believing based upon evidence.

³¹ I use murder as an example, Exodus 20:13, Romans 13:9, but the same can be said of stealing Ex 20:15, adultery Ex 20:14 etc.

³² The separation model not only delegitimizes religious opinions in the public square, government locales, it also has either the unstated goal or indubitable consequential effect of either seeking to exclude it from public dialog or at least make the scolding for expressing it such that few have the spiritual fortitude to withstand the backlash. Brit Hume’s recommendation to Tiger Woods to turn to the Christian faith provides a recent example. Arguments can come from a source (whether religious or not) that others reject, e.g. recent study, opinion poll, scientific experiment, or the Bible, as long as there is evidence that is reasonable and accessible to all (history, archeology, logic, human experience, internal consistency) supporting the reliability of the source regardless if everyone agrees on the sufficiency of the evidence.

Further, to use an authority does not mean that everyone has to accept the claim of the authority, be it the latest poll, study, experiment, Bible, etc. In addition, one’s ideas should not be excluded from public debate because of his faith in God or because it is in part religiously motivated as though that is somehow a violation of the First Amendment or indistinguishable from seeking to establish a theocracy, which is at best faulty logic.

³³ For example, Christianity has some beliefs like the Trinity, which are derived from its authoritative text. The void created by the expulsion of religious opinions is filled by secularism, and secularism is not benign. “Secularism is highly intrusive in the imposition of secular liberal values. It establishes public schools that systematically indoctrinate young people in secular humanism and prohibit the free expression of religion; it attempts to redefine masculinity and femininity by changing the culture of the family, the workplace, and the military; it launches its own versions of moral crusades, such as anti-smoking...in trying to restructure a private association like the Boy Scouts to diminish its moral opposition to homosexuality and to repudiate its religious roots [and so on].” Sweetman, *Politics Needs Religion*, 148. Secularism and materialism’s record for coexistence with religion should be enough to merit the sober embrace of religion’s place in the public square for all but the blindest of materialists--think Stalin, Mao Zedong, Hitler, eugenics, and abortion, etc.

³⁴ Since it is inevitable that ideas based on or associated with one set of faith assumptions will be imposed upon all of society through public policy, it is thereby immoral, in a republic or democratic society, to aprioristically exclude rationally accessibly evidenced ideas from public debate merely because of their derivation, which is the logical fallacy known as the genetic fallacy. For example, the acceptance of secularism in education results in things like “values clarification” which is premised upon the belief that there is no one standard of right and wrong which is suitable for public policy other than the standard of values clarification, which is actually a derivative of a scientific view of the world. Since faith assumptions are always present in substantive deliberations and discussions, it is not reasonable or moral to

summarily dismiss an argument in a democratic society because it is associated with a certain set of faith assumptions as long as the argument affords accessible evidence for its support or source.

³⁵ The Declaration of Independence mentions our dependency upon God three times: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness....appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world...with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence...”

³⁶ It affords science its rightful place with all the dignity of which the scientific enterprise is worthy. Science is able to bring its influence to bear upon education and other social enterprises, as well as debate in the public square, so long as it speaks as science within the legitimate domain of science. It addresses the intricacies and nuances of the church state relationship better than the Separation model, but science, Darwinism, and secularism are wholly inadequate to be the supreme gatekeepers of the public mind.