2

Standing at the Precipice: Faith in the Age of Science and Technology

Azizah Y. al-Hibri

We discussed earlier that strand of European liberalism that reached our shores and influenced our constitutional views on the separation of church and state. This tradition was based on several assumptions. As pointed out, among them is the assumption that individuals could seal themselves off into compartments to be believers one moment, good citizens the next. Another is the assumption that religion is retrograde, that it will be overtaken by reason. These assumptions fit well with certain secular assumptions of modern science, especially when combined with the mech-

AZIZAH Y. AL-HIBRI is professor of law at the T.C. Williams School of Law at the University of Richmond, founding editor of *Hypatia: a Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, and founder and vice president of KARAMAH: Muslim Women Lawyers for Human Rights. She is author of a book on deontic logic and many articles on Muslim women's rights, democracy, and human rights. She is a member of the editorial board of *The Journal of Law and Religion* and *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, contributing editor of *Second Opinion*, and member of the Board of Advisors of The Religion and Human Rights Series at Emory University. Dr. al-Hibri is also a member of the Advisory Board of the Pluralism Project at Harvard University and Religion and Ethics NewsWeekly for PBS.

anistic model of reality on which the Industrial Revolution was based.[1]

The mechanistic model of the Industrial Revolution has thoroughly permeated not only our technological world, but more importantly, our very consciousness, even subconsciousness. It has structured our worldview and cast its shadow over every aspect of our lives. It has also shaped our fundamental assumptions. Our view of scientific thought, professional behavior, medicine, business, education, even religion has been influenced by it. Divisions on the Supreme Court in the debates over the separation of church and state clearly reflect it. The consequences, both positive and negative, have been immense. Dehumanization, fragmentation, and conflict are among the most troubling. For people of faith in particular, it has meant a schizophrenic existence. It has legitimated a separation of faith from public life, causing an unfortunate rupture that marginalized faith as it privatized one's deepest-held beliefs and values.

At the cusp of the second millennium, however, a new age has dawned upon us. It is the Age of Information that emphasizes interconnectedness, decentralization, and innovation. This new age tends to promote an organic as opposed to a mechanistic reality. It abandons a hierarchical mechanistic logic in favor of "flattened" networks of relationships. It replaces the ideology of conflict that characterized the Industrial Age with a new ideology of cooperation. It replaces homogeneity with diversity, and centralization with increased participation and democracy. Properly understood and managed, this age can usher in better political, social, and economic relations in our society and in the world.[2] Left in chaos, it could result in the disarray of our various institutions.

Our generation is in the unique position of being able to either birth this new age or suppress its development by forcing it into outmoded First Industrial molds. We have been raised in the Old World, but history demands from us that we define the contours of the New World. In some sense, our task is no less critical than that of our Founding Fathers who ushered in a new era of liberation and democracy into a world burdened with oppression and tyranny. Thus we must engage in serious deliberations, taking into account our true state of affairs, before we reach our conclusions.

In launching his extensive critique of our mechanical techno-
logical culture, Marshall McLuhan, the oracle of this new age,
noted in *The Gutenberg Galaxy* that "[h]itherto most people have ac-
cepted their cultures as fate . . .; but our emphatic awareness of the
exact modes of many cultures is itself a liberation from them as pris-
ons." We need not be prisoners of our old mechanistic culture, and
in fact have been slowly liberating ourselves from it. But to prop-
erly plan for and accelerate the future, we need to understand the
past. We need to uncover the impact certain unwarranted as-
sumptions underlying the mechanistic models have had on us, not
only in industry but also socially, politically, and legally. Indeed,
these assumptions have so permeated our lives that they have be-
come practically invisible.

The Story of Modern Science and Technology

Faith and reason have been juxtaposed in theological and philo-
sophical discussions for centuries, sometimes with reason portrayed
as the handmaiden of religion but at others, as polar opposites.
These discussions have not always been cordial. They flourished and
took new forms during the European Renaissance and Enlighten-
ment. Finally, they reached the shores of this land during and after
the American Enlightenment.

Today, the issues raised by these discussions have shifted in great
part to areas related to science and technology, but the discussions
remain as vibrant as ever.[3] The issues permeate all aspects of our
American life from educational and artistic arenas to constitutional
and political ones. Often, however, people of faith have been dis-
advantaged in these discussions precisely because the image of sci-
ence and technology in the public square is one of "secularity,"
"objectivity," and "provability," while religious belief continues to
be commonly cast as "superstitious," "irrational," and "private."

This situation is not conducive to a dialogue based on equality
and mutual respect, and has alienated important segments of our
society from each other. In part, this state of affairs is the result of
the great successes of modern science and the notable excesses of
some groups and individuals in the name of faith. Unfortunately,
however, our great admiration for science has led to its mystifica-

tion, and has endowed it with unjustified *secular political authority*. In a way, science has become the new religion. This development has created problems even for scientific researchers. It threatens to hinder further scientific progress and undermine our system of democracy;[4] therefore, in the next few paragraphs, I shall highlight some vulnerabilities of modern science in order to accelerate better science, greater innovation, and a vigorous democracy.

It is important to remember that science has not always adopted a secular point of view. Many of the basic elements in the foundation of modern science and technology were laid in medieval times by Islamic scholars such as Jaber Ibn Hayyan, al-Khawarizmi, Ibn al-Haitham, and Ibn Sina (Avecinna). None of these scientists recognized a conflict between reason (whether deductive or inductive) and faith. In fact, they recognized a deeper spiritual reality and believed firmly that God created the world according to specific laws. It was their task to discover these laws as proof of the wonders of God. Their approach, which was also based on experimentation and observation, arranged the metaphysics of Islamic science on the basis of faith.

Modern science has other spiritual origins. For example, the regular measurement of time was an important element of the budding industrial world. In fact, some view the mechanical clock as the key machine of the Industrial Age. Very early on, monasteries of the West, with their time-sequenced bells and orderly routine, provided an early example of the ordered life and the orderly universe created by God. For this reason, some authors have even argued that the Industrial Age derived its mechanical conception of time in part from the routine of the monastery. Furthermore, many monks were among the early scientists. In fact, Roger Bacon was a monk; so was Gregor Mendel. These observations provide a useful perspective for understanding Alfred Whitehead's emphasis on the importance of scholastic belief in a universe ordered by God to the foundations of modern physics.

Even our Founding Fathers seem to have viewed faith and reason as allies. For example, Thomas Jefferson, who was quite interested in science and technology, was accused by his opponents of atheism. Nevertheless, in a letter to Peter Carr in 1787, Jefferson told him that "[y]our own reason is the only oracle given you by heaven,

and you are answerable not only for the rightness but uprightness of the decision." In a letter to David Barrow in 1815, Jefferson also stated that "[w]e are not in a world ungoverned by the laws and the power of a superior agent."

Today's science, popularly conceived as "secular," "objective," and "provable," actually makes unprovable metaphysical assumptions. This is one reason that, despite undeniable successes, the scientific image has come recently under attack from within the scientific and philosophical communities. Some scientists have pointed to the selectivity of data gathered and the subjectivity of the scientist as real problems in developing an "objective" scientific theory.[5] That is, scientific data are often distorted by human consciousness. Others have pointed to unwarranted assumptions made by scientists, such as the denial of intelligent design in the universe. Charles Townes, the Nobel Prize winning physicist and chief inventor of the laser, noted that "[p]ositing that essential features of the natural world are explained by billions of variables that cannot be observed strikes me as much more freewheeling than any of the church's claims."[6] Townes represents a growing trend among modern scientists to question the secular biases of science.[7]

Also, feminists have charged traditional scientists with patriarchal bias in the gathering of data and development of theories.[8] For example, Ruth Bleier argues that otherwise-good scientists "have shown serious suspensions of critical judgment in interpretations of their own and others' data." They have "ignored the known 'complexity and malleability of human developments' to make 'unsubstantiated conjectures' not one of which 'is known to be descriptive of scientifically verifiable reality as we know it today.'"[9]

For this reason, Elizabeth Lloyd and others argue that it makes for *better* science "to encourage the training and full participation of informed researchers with a variety of background experiences, preconceptions, and viewpoints, precisely because such inclusion will encourage a wider variety of working hypotheses as well as a more thorough challenge and testing of any given scientific hypothesis or theory under consideration.[10] The object therefore is not to discredit science, but to "demystify" it and make it more exact.[11] This can only be done by undermining the *social and political authority* of science that attempts to shield its shortcomings from public

view and opening up the field for informed, intelligent, and democratic exchange of ideas.[12]

Despite its spiritual roots, modern science blossomed on fundamentally secular mechanistic assumptions for which there was no conclusive proof. A truly scientific attitude would have left the door open for entertaining all workable possibilities. As a result, science has often been reduced to "scientism," that is, an ideological tool based on views not fully supported by data. As the result of these unwarranted assumptions, new alternative theories continue to struggle hard for acceptability in our scientific society. Three recent examples in the area of medicine come to mind: spirituality, acupuncture, and holistic medicine. Only recently, and most likely as a result of patient pressure, did the medical profession finally decide to take a serious look at them.[13] As a result, significant progress recently has been achieved.

As these examples illustrate, the real problem with ideologically biased scientific attitude is that it could slam the door in the face of valuable future innovation. Worse yet, it would continue to embolden harmful attitudes within and toward humanity. To avoid these consequences, we need to introduce to the world of science, as we did to our society, the concept of "diversity," in this case, intellectual diversity. We also need to legitimize the language of spirituality in the halls of science to the extent that unwarranted secular metaphysical assumptions are being made.

In the Information Age, human capital is more important than financial capital. So we need to train our children in the art and science of critical reasoning. It is appalling how little training in this area our children receive before they reach college. As a result, they are unable to evaluate properly much of the unsupported secular scientific and other information directed at them at an early age. This educational defect breeds a generation of automatons who internalize uncritically whatever is given to them, an unacceptable state of affairs in a country that values freedom of thought and democracy.

Furthermore, recent studies about innovation and the Information Age show that new structures based on intellectual openness, cooperation, and a vigorous exchange of ideas are fueling the remarkable accomplishments in Silicon Valley.[14] So vigorous is this ex-

change of ideas that many no longer attach much significance to trade secrets. The result has catapulted our country to the forefront of world development. Given these data that support intellectual openness and organizational democracy in the interest of innovation, there is no excuse for the continued sequestering of science from ideologically "unpopular" ideas, such as those rooted in feminist, environmentalist, spiritual, or faith perspectives.

Further, the values of cooperation and promotion of communal interest reflected in Silicon Valley are important values traditionally advocated by faith communities. These are clearly to be contrasted with the values prevalent among employees in highly competitive hierarchical corporations or scientists competing for funding in traditional institutions.

The Broken Promises of Science, Technology, and Religion

I have argued that "closing" the scientific mind to other promising ways of looking at the world undermines democracy, suffocates innovation, and harms society. I have examined the first two claims and turn now to the third.

The benefits to society of scientific and technological innovation are obvious, but they have not measured up to expectations. Despite unprecedented wealth, our country has eliminated neither poverty nor homelessness. Millions of American children and senior citizens still go to bed hungry, and an even larger number has no medical insurance. Furthermore, industrialization has sprouted its own local and global problems.

For example, until punitive laws were passed, producers adulterated bread to increase their margins of profit, and manufacturers operated sweatshops for children. In the 1970s companies that sold infant formula used aggressive marketing methods in Third World countries, despite the fact that placing a baby on the bottle there was often hazardous to its health and at times resulted in death. These days, genetic engineering, which promises to eliminate certain illnesses, has been used in agricultural research to produce terminator seed, i.e., seed genetically designed to render second-generation seed sterile. This means that farmers can no longer save

seed from their harvest. They have to purchase it from an increas-
ingly concentrated global market of seed companies. This devel-
opment will spell even greater trouble to the beleaguered American
small farmer.

Also, free trade and the globalization of business have been
viewed as having a negative effect on workers' wages, whether in
the Third World or in industrialized countries. It is these kinds of
concerns that finally led to the angry demonstrations in Seattle dur-
ing the World Trade Organization's meeting, and protests against
the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Wash-
ington.[15] The Frankenstein monster appears to have gone out of
control. Workers, farmers, environmentalists, and other concerned
individuals in the United States and around the world are simulta-
neously angry and scared.

The voices of the people of faith in the United States on these
issues have been relatively muffled and fragmented. The loudest ar-
gument being heard is about the "height" of the wall between
church and state as described in Supreme Court cases. It appears
that many people of faith have internalized the arguments for mar-
ket efficiency, maximization of profit, and preserving our "super-
power" status. Many religious institutions have in fact benefited
greatly from their business investments. This situation has created
a "shared vision" between corporations and shareholders, many of
whom are people of faith and religious institutions. This shared
material vision has unfortunately often dulled spiritual sensibilities.

People of faith need to reexamine their priorities as well as their
basic assumptions. We need, for example, to reflect on the legal
proposition that the duty of corporate directors is to maximize
shareholder wealth. In the 1980s, many older employees lost their
jobs and were left unemployable in a process called "downsizing"
designed to maximize shareholder wealth. The wave of mergers and
acquisitions that made many shareholders very wealthy often re-
sulted in bankruptcies that harmed the interests of creditors and em-
ployees. As a result, stakeholder statutes were enacted in many states
permitting directors to consider interests of other stakeholders in a
company, such as creditors and employees, in reaching their final
decision.

These stakeholder laws and subsequent thinking on corporate

legal reform originated from concerned citizens, many of whom do not have a clear religious affiliation or motive, and some of whom may in fact be nonbelievers in God but believers in humanity and decency.[16] Until recently, people of faith and their institutions defined their domain of responsibility very narrowly, confining it to general moral pronouncements with no concrete solutions in professional or other specialized areas of knowledge. As a result, they have marginalized themselves in this society and have been viewed as old fashioned and irrelevant to solving the problems of the modern world. This state of affairs has begun to change and must change if we truly believe in the relevance of faith to the modern world.

Fragmented and Compartmentalized Existence

The mechanistic model of the First Industrial Revolution continues to dominate our society today despite the fact that many branches of science have abandoned that model. We have borrowed this outmoded model and embedded it in various aspects of our lives. Now it is time for us to catch up with our future possibilities. This demands a conscious critique of the ways in which the mechanistic model has been embedded in our culture, and how it has affected our lives.

The model gives rise to the mechanistic approach that consists of reducing entities into their components and then isolating these components to study them in great detail. In other words, under this approach an entity is equal to the sum of its parts. There is no recognition of an organic whole that could transcend the sum of these parts. Despite the fact that the mechanistic model and related approach have become obsolete in the Information Age, our universities, corporations, hospitals, and social and other institutions continue to be organized in accordance with them.

In the field of modern business, we view a corporation as the basic building block. It is kept in good operation by a balance of power among directors, officers, and shareholders. In determining corporate policies, the board of directors is expected to restrict itself to determining what is best for the corporation and its shareholders. Such is the proper professional attitude. The effect of such

policies on the community or the country is beyond the scope of matters considered by the board except to the extent it may adversely affect the image of the corporation in the community and hence its profits.

Decades ago, the philosopher Erich Fromm pointed out that today's notions of efficiency are defined too narrowly. What is an efficient policy for a corporation may not be efficient for the community or the country as a whole. In that case, he was referring to a policy by a phone company of monitoring telephone operators. He argued that such monitoring is bad for operators, engendering in them feelings of inadequacy, anxiety, and frustration. Hence this policy is ultimately bad for the community. Today, monitoring has become commonplace, and the harm to workers' psyche is no longer a major concern.

Law reflects a similar approach of fragmentation and compartmentalization. Corporate law, for example, deals with corporate governance issues and shareholder interests. It leaves out totally an important part of the corporation, namely the employees. To find out about these, we have to enter a whole new field, that of labor law. By fragmenting discussion in this fashion, we have a distorted perspective of what constitutes good policies for the corporation and what maximizes wealth. Had we put the two areas together, we could have discovered quickly, for example, that certain policies would reduce worker loyalty and lead to a drop in production and profitability. Individuals who support better integrated corporate policies that take into account societal interests are often viewed as "soft" and ineffective.

Our large firms are often organized in ways that do not recognize sufficiently the existence of the family. Associate lawyers on Wall Street may work twenty hours a day. Resident doctors in large cities may be on call every other night. We are told that such grueling schedules ensure excellent professional training. In fact, they raise the margin of profit for the employer, while shifting the human and financial costs of this policy to the employees, their clients or patients, and their families. The prolonged working hours of the employees render them more susceptible to error and make their families feel burdened and abandoned. This unfortunate state of affairs is partly the reason for our high divorce rate and the increase in the

number of troubled children. These profit-maximizing policies may
benefit the firm or hospital, but they result in a world where hu-
manity is degraded, emotional ties are frayed and withered, and
humans are disposable and fungible.

Even in matters of faith, we have internalized this defective
mechanistic model. Our lives are often viewed as consisting of two
components, the public and the private. Our beliefs are also viewed
as a collection of component beliefs, one of which may be reli-
gious. Given the bias against religion in the public space, we have
learned to leave the religious component to the private space. True,
many politicians have been using religious public language nowa-
days to further their political goals, but in doing so they have de-
valued religious language in the public square. Significantly, they
also stirred a great deal of controversy when they were earnest
about their statements.

Many of us believe that under the "common language" ap-
proach it is possible to find common ground among believers and
nonbelievers. This can be done by simply focusing on nonreligious
component beliefs and by using nonreligious "common" public lan-
guage, i.e., language from which expressly religious terms and ideas
have been expunged.[17] Now, as the Williamsburg Charter makes
clear, "civility obliges citizens in a pluralistic society to take great
care in using words and casting issues.[18] But that does not mean that
religious language must be expunged from conversation in the pub-
lic square. Indeed, there are times when expunging it actually leads
to loss of both information and effective communication.

For example, we can all agree that democracy is essential because
we all agree to our constitutional principles. It is not important for
us to know, however, that Sam's agreement is rooted in his Christ-
ian view that God created us all equal, whereas, John's is rooted in
his secular liberal beliefs. That is viewed as superfluous information
that, if explored, may bring out serious differences. But this pref-
erence for "surface information" impoverishes the national dia-
logue at times, imperils it at others, and reduces every individual to
a "black box." It measures success by individual outcomes without
developing a real feel for what may be happening under the sur-
face. In the past, this absence of effective communication has led
to polarization, and even violence.[19] To describe the "surface in-

formation approach" in engineering terms, it could build bridges on shaky, unexplored grounds rendering them vulnerable to collapse when placed under stress. For this reason, it is important to balance the need for a common language with the need to express certain important ideas in one's own faith language. Perhaps ultimately we may even be able to weave the two alternatives successfully together.

Just as significant is the fact that by asking persons of faith to reconstruct their language and arguments in the public square, we are placing upon them unique burdens not shared by their secular friends. Persons of faith presenting an argument in the public square will now have to redesign it, remold it, and reconfigure it in order to have it make sense to a secular audience. They may or may not succeed in this attempt. If they miss, their contribution will be used as yet another example of how people of faith are biased, retrograde, and make no sense. Their secular counterparts usually have no such burdens placed upon them. They can say exactly what they think. They do not need to reconfigure and reshape their arguments in order to appeal to a religious public square. This state of affairs damages democracy by creating two types of citizens: one defines acceptable public language and ideas; the other has to comply with that definition. This is why many people of faith feel like second-class citizens in these United States.

Other aspects of the secularized public square place additional stress and burdens on committed people of faith. Because of their worldview and its attendant values that preach cooperation, honesty, and egalitarianism, committed people of faith in particular will find the values of the modern workplace intolerable. This is not to argue that some secularists do not experience similar conflicts, but rather that the worldview of committed people of faith is inherently in conflict with the values of today's workplace. On the other hand, secularist values and worldviews vary widely, and some do not engender these types of inherent conflicts.

We have already spoken about the intense competitive climate and rigid hierarchical structure in many American corporations. We now turn to specific examples. In advertising, whether employee or employer, the person of faith has to please the client. This involves at times promoting questionable products, such as cigarettes, and defective products, such as car models that have a propensity to

overturn. In the area of health care, an HMO employee may find himself or herself in the position of having to deny many medical claims that he or she would otherwise have accepted but for the over-reaching profit-maximizing policies of the HMO. In law, the partner or associate is bound by the adversarial system to seek the best, but not necessarily the fairest, arrangement for the client. In government, an elected official is often beholden to his or her financial supporters not his or her conscience.

Surely, a person of faith can reject all these traps, but then there are not too many options left for earning a living. As a result, the person of faith will have to develop either a schizophrenic personality or a maladjusted one. In the first case, he or she would live the secular life during the working days of the week and the religious life over the weekend. His or her two lives would be out of touch with or irrelevant to each other. In the second case, he or she can refuse to lead a fragmented existence, thus feeling oppressed, anguished, alienated, and unhappy. Such an individual radiates unhappiness to those around him or her.

Most of us try to straddle the two alternatives by opting for unhappiness sometimes, denial at other times. But we never have a real opportunity to live the spiritually integrated life we desire. Secularists who are not committed to values similar to ours experience no such conflicts. This alone is sufficient to show that the public square is not neutral between religionists and nonreligionists. It is significantly slanted in favor of secular ethics that conflict with our own. But we are prohibited from critiquing these values, because we cannot bring our religious beliefs openly and honestly to the public square. Instead, we have to search for innocuous (nonreligious, even nontheist) common language that would express our critique without divulging the heart of the conflict. How did we get to this point, when the Founding Fathers were theists who strongly believed in a Creator? To answer this question, we need to take a quick look at the handiwork of the Supreme Court over the past few decades.

Separation of Church and State

The mechanistic approach of compartmentalizing religion lends support to the Supreme Court's attempt to erect a high wall of sep-

aration between church and state. For this reason, it is useful to highlight some of the mechanistic assumptions about the world and the nature of belief that appear to undergird certain Supreme Court opinions.

According to some justices, the establishment clause embodies the view that religion "must be a private matter for the individual, the family, and the institutions of private choice." But, as argued earlier, it does not make sense to tell people of faith to cabin their faith to the privacy of their own sphere, for their faith is not just one more component of their set of beliefs. It is rather an integral part of their worldview. The real issue is not about cabinning one's faith, but rather about ways of sharing one's faith perspective in the public square without coercion or acrimony. In the age of pluralism in America, the challenge to develop new ways of communicating and interacting is urgent. Mechanistic assumptions and solutions only serve to deny the problem and delay its resolution.

A proper understanding of the establishment clause is especially significant today, where the governmental public square has expanded considerably. This expansion provides new grounds for arguing today that since the American Constitution has guaranteed for people of faith the right to freedom of conscience, then they should be able to exercise that freedom openly in the governmental public square, side by side with those who are not people of faith.[20] Otherwise, the right of people of faith to free exercise would be severely limited. Recently the Court wrestled with this issue yet one more time, trying to balance the right of people of faith to free exercise with the Court's concern about the coercive majoritarian policies and the appearance of governmental establishment of religion.[21]

The Supreme Court has articulated several different approaches to the establishment clause and the separation of church and state. Three major approaches, which will be discussed below, have come to be known as "strict separationism," "endorsement," and "accommodationism."[22]

Strict Separationism

The first approach views religion and government as two separate "spheres" that should not be permitted to interfere or be "mixed"

with each other. These interpretations are clearly influenced by the mechanistic view that assumes the possibility of such sequestering. It takes the "wall of separation" imagery used by Jefferson perhaps too literally. This approach is rooted in the historical conflicts of this nation and not in hostility toward religion.

Separatists trace their views to Jefferson, Madison, the Baptists, and others. Our Founding Fathers were theists who wanted the state to stay out of the church's business. Coming from a European background, they were only too familiar with state oppression resulting from the adoption by the state of an "official" religion, and then using that as a tool to oppress others. In fact, some Founding Fathers were already aware of serious examples of religious intolerance in their own backyard in Virginia.

The travails of Baptists, such as John Weatherford, James Ireland, and John Waller, are well documented.[23] Ultimately, John Leland, the most popular Baptist preacher in Virginia, is reported to have met with Madison. As a result of this meeting, the Baptists helped elect Madison and supposedly influenced his decision to secure the First Amendment.[24] That was, of course, only part of the picture. Other parts of the country were experiencing similar problems.

It is these sorts of considerations and the commitment to freedom of conscience that led the Founding Fathers to erect a "wall of separation" to keep out the state from the affairs of the various religious communities. There is nothing in their views that leads one to conclude that they envisioned a secularized governmental public square in which religious points of view are discriminated against in favor of nonreligion.

Stripping the public square from all religious encouragement, symbols, and words does not leave it neutral; rather it leaves it secular (i.e., nontheist). By doing so, the state policy in effect favors nonreligion over religion.

This point was made very clearly by Justice Douglas in 1952 in *Zorach v. Clauson:*

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. . . . When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our tra-

ditions. . . . To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a re-
quirement that government show callous indifference to religious groups. That
would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do be-
lieve.

From a more philosophical perspective, the argument is much
clearer. By removing all religious symbols and words from the gov-
ernmental public square, it becomes one where only a nonreligious
worldview is expressed. Under such worldview, God becomes a
mere private option that can be added or subtracted from one's set
of beliefs.

Persons of true faith cannot possibly adopt this point of view. For
them, God is at the center of the universe and God defines all their
relations within society and the family. God is not a private option
added to their beliefs but the very center post of these beliefs. Take
God out, then their system is hollow, rendering it extremely vul-
nerable. This state of affairs is akin to that of asking secularists to
restate their views after adding to them one simple assumption,
namely, the existence of God. Clearly, that one simple assumption
will wreak havoc on their worldview, forcing them to reshape their
arguments and remold them in ways that would be oppressive to
them. If they are burdened by our demand and cannot satisfy it suc-
cessfully, why should persons of faith be expected to do so instead?
Given these analytic considerations, it is hard to see how our con-
cept of neutrality does not prefer nonreligion over religion.

Legal discussions about "neutrality" rarely confronted the diffi-
cult philosophical problems engulfing the concept. Instead, judicial
concepts of neutrality have been reduced to discussions of the le-
gality of governmental "aid" to religions.[25] The more serious ques-
tion, however, is not about aid. It is about the true *nature* of a
framework of government that is thoroughly secular and its *impact*
on our policies, domestic and foreign, on our judicial decisions, and
even on the consciousness of our young generation educated within
such a system. Ronald Thieman addresses this concern at length,
concluding that "[w]hen under the guise of neutrality, government
actually prefers one conception of the good over another, it misleads
the public concerning government's roles in the adjudication of
volatile moral and political matters."[26] The result is a sharpening
of conflicts and a loss of trust in government.

It is also important to remember the context in which Jefferson, Madison, the Baptists, and others made their comments. The issue then was not whether the state would be theist or atheist, but rather that the state could not take sides among the various competing "sects." Further, those who did not care to take any side because they held different beliefs altogether were assured freedom of conscience. This is the import of Jefferson's statement that it neither picked his pocket nor broke his leg if his neighbor were an atheist. His neighbor can hold any belief he or she wants in this country. It does not follow, however, that Jefferson was recommending that the state emulate that neighbor in the name of "neutrality."

Additionally, we have to keep in mind that the state Jefferson was contemplating was a minimalist state in which being a member of Congress was not considered a full-time job. Today, our modern state has broken the bounds of minimalism and grown into a behemoth that has invaded numerous aspects of our society. As a result, the "governmental" public square and the "civic" one have overlapped significantly. Under these conditions, placing strict separatist restrictions on our government can only lead to the establishment of secularism in our *society* and not just in our government. If anything, the Founding Fathers, the history of this country, and the belief of the overwhelming majority of Americans today in a divine being indicate that such a development goes against the grain.

Supporters of the separationist approach tacitly admit the untenability of its strict application when they permit limited contact with religion. Accordingly, religion may be recognized by the state as an aspect of the country's history or culture. Government is permitted to use symbols or practices that have lost their religious significance. Among these some Justices have included our national motto "In God We Trust" and the reference to God in the Pledge of Allegiance.

This view raises the following question: in a country where the overwhelming majority of citizens are theists, for whom did these symbols lose their religious significance? Most likely to the secularists, otherwise they would complain about them, and the symbols would likely be removed from the governmental public square to avoid the appearance of establishment of religion. This suggests

that we can bring religious symbols and practices into the governmental public square so long as the secularists declare them devoid of religious significance. Secularists then hold immense power over our governmental public square.[27] They determine what symbols may be brought into it. Religionists have no similar power. This means that we live in a state that favors nonreligion over religion.

The Endorsement Approach

This approach is less mechanistic; it is also fairer in its treatment of religion. It recognizes the increasingly wider area of intersection between church and state and permits religious expression by the state so long as it does not have the effect of endorsing religion. This means that the state may use religious symbols in holiday displays, so long as the overall display makes clear that the state does not endorse their religious significance. The endorsement view argues for equal protection among religions and between religion and nonreligion. Under this view, the state does not need to argue that a Christmas tree has become a secular symbol; it only needs to make clear that it is not endorsing its religious significance, whatever that may be.[28]

Unfortunately, the trend on the Court has been one of giving interpretations of this test that result in a strict separationist approach. For example, Justice Souter has argued that the endorsement approach, when carried to its logical conclusion, would require striking down not only graduation prayers but also traditional government practices, such as religious proclamations and religious invocations at Thanksgiving. Justice Brennan and Justice Stevens argue that the use of symbols that retain any religious meaning is unconstitutional, because it will have an endorsement effect. These interpretations of the endorsement approach suggest that fundamental questions about the nature of our government and the viability of the mechanistic separationist approach in the legal arena must be addressed.

The Accommodationist Approach

In *Allegheny v. ACLU*, Justice Kennedy argued that religious expression by the state was permissible as long as the government does not

coerce participation. In other words, the state may recognize, accommodate, even support religion, so long as it does not proselytize or effectively establish or tend to establish, through direct aid for example, a state religion. Under this approach, we do not need to deny the religious significance of our national motto "In God We Trust." Nor does our public square need to lead a fragmented or compartmentalized existence. On the other hand, under this view, secularists may feel like outsiders, and even some people of faith may feel nervous, if the state consistently chooses to walk a thin line between establishment and support of a particular religion.

The best solution for dealing with these concerns is a vigorous and honest national debate. Thieman, for example, views the notion of separation as outmoded and calls for fresh jurisprudence that takes into account the original insights of Madison and is based on such fundamental values as freedom, equality, and mutual respect.[29] John Witte calls for new balances among the principles of separation of church and state, equality of plural religions, and liberty of conscience.[30] In their proposals, both authors are mindful of the concerns of minority religions and the new religious diversity in America.

Minority religions are also mindful of the possibility of the tyranny of the majority. An educated national dialogue, that is, one that has been sensitized to such matters as civility, diversity, and conflict resolution, provides valuable opportunities. It can help build reliable bridges of trust at all levels of society. It can also help us diagnose unrecognized barriers, problems, and attitudes. Those engaging in the dialogue may learn to go beyond tolerance to understanding and respect. We need to recognize that the times in which we live represent a critical era in the history of our country. If we do not try to rise to the level of sincerity, commitment, and constitutional wisdom exhibited by our predecessors, the muddled and biased *status quo* will prevail, and the next generation of Americans will pay a heavy price.

To be successful, our national dialogue must be inclusive. This means that we need to hear the concerns of secularists and have them hear the concerns of people of faith. We need to discuss with each other not just the establishment clause, but also the failure of the mechanistic strict separationist approach to life and the fact that the present state of affairs is not "neutral" and thus violates the

First Amendment. The secularists must be helped to recognize the frustration and unhappiness of many people of faith with this inequitable regime of constitutional interpretation. While fully committed to the Constitution, people of faith are no longer willing to live in this country as second class citizens nor sacrifice the moral upbringing of their children. The present regime of constitutional interpretation has led to the secularization of the public square and the relativization of values. This troubles people of faith deeply, because the next generation of Americans is already showing signs of moral distress.

We should initiate this important dialogue as soon as possible. But first, we should each take a good look at who we really are and what do we really stand for. Labels do not usually mean much. It is what is in the heart that counts. For this reason, I shall now turn to a Biblical/Qur'anic story that will shed light on a real difference between a person of faith and a nonbeliever. It cuts through labels to show that a believer is someone who does not try to be like God. Under this definition, many secular humanists exhibit, in some important sense, faith.

Adam's Modern Folly

The Bible tells us that the serpent that tempted Eve was very subtle. The divine prohibition had warned Adam and Eve against eating from the tree, "lest you die." But the serpent contradicted this divine warning and promised them that "your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." Eve also saw that the tree "was to be desired to make one wise." She and Adam ate from the forbidden tree. The Qur'an tells us also that Satan tempted both Adam and Eve promising them eternal life and power. Adam and Eve both succumbed to this temptation.

The underlying theme of both stories is that humans desire to become divine even in the face of an explicit divine warning. That is the human folly or arrogance, for there is only one God, and we are not that God. Modern science and technology hold for today's Adam and Eve the same promise of knowledge, power, and eternal life, and despite the fact that it may destroy us ("lest you die"), Adam and Eve are not deterred.

Often authors wonder as to why the Industrial Revolution did not take place in the Ottoman Empire despite its advanced scientific and technological knowledge. There are many answers to that question, such as the absence of political and intellectual "openness." The Founding Fathers made a studied effort to avoid duplicating systems they viewed as despotic, including that of Turkey. Authors of that period also noted that there was very little free flow of information within the Ottoman Empire.

There is, however, one more factor that is worth examining. Muslim scholars were averse to spreading certain types of knowledge broadly, lest they fall in the wrong hands. For this reason, they often employed symbolisms to disguise the facts and make them accessible to only the most committed students. This cautious attitude was based on their worldview of celebrating and protecting God's creation, not replacing him. In the United States today, we have accomplished greater political and intellectual "openness" than many other societies. All types of knowledge are freely available on the Internet and in the libraries, including nuclear know-how. But the democratization of information has not been matched with widespread moral and spiritual education. As a result, we have an age in which violence, whether in inner cities, suburbs, airports, or even high schools, has become commonplace. Power has become a common idiom in communication, and violence has become the first line of argumentation.

Given this state of affairs, it is easy to understand (though not agree with) Nietzsche's declaration that God is dead, that Christian morality of meekness, humility, and charity is slave morality, and that a new breed of men has been born, that of the *Ubermensch* (superman) who is hard against himself and who must reject being merely human. The strong, Nietzsche argued, will inherit the earth. It should come as no surprise that this view was crassly appropriated by no one less than Hitler. The latter was reportedly told by the philosopher's sister that he was what her brother had in mind when he wrote about the *Ubermensch*. Freed from the burdens of Christian "slave morality," Hitler was able to scientifically annihilate millions of Jews, as well as Turks, gypsies, and others. Thus technology, without moral values, goes amok. While not every secularist is power hungry and not every person of faith is meek, the pres-

ence of faith in the public square helps anchor important moral values that many secular humanists may have very well discovered on their own.

Technology is thus a tool that the power hungry are anxious to misuse. It is in the hands of the righteous and the humane that it can fulfill its promise. But who are those? Do they include our religious leaders? History shows otherwise. History provides numerous examples of how religious individuals or institutions have used their beliefs as a tool to accumulate power, a purely selfish materialist goal. That is of course the ultimate insult to religion, i.e., using it as a tool to achieve the worst of secular goals. But that is the problem with Adam. He remains vulnerable to temptation and never gives up hope of becoming like God. In the meantime, he does the next best thing, namely, establish domination on earth, whether over nature, women, or other men.

Just as Adam was warned of destruction in the Bible, so do modern philosophers warn today's Adam as well. Herbert Marcuse, the Marxist philosopher, argued that in a society based on power and domination, the forces of Eros (love) are overpowered by the forces of Thanatos (death).[31] Unfortunately, this argument is proving only too true with the Columbine High School killings and other incidents of child violence. Our own kids are devouring themselves. In our rush to power, individually and collectively, we have destroyed the fabric of society that fosters love, affection, and interconnectedness. We have generated national anguish, anger, and hopelessness, all of which are fodder for Thanatos. In that, we are all guilty, people of faith as well as nonbelievers. Our guilt is compounded by our continued silence, as a nation, about our violence against Native Americans that destroyed many tribes and continues to harm others. We have also been silent about the violence toward Africans who were subjected to slavery and their American descendants who continue to suffer in other ways. So far, most of us have refused to publically lift the veil of silence about these issues and initiate a national dialogue for truth and reconciliation.

While the feminists fought against patriarchal domination and oppressive hierarchies, the environmentalists fought against unfettered domination and destruction of nature, and the humanists and labor unions fought for human dignity, many people of faith were

often notably absent from the arena. To varying degrees many have
succumbed to temptation and quietly partook of the fruits of the
forbidden tree hoping that no one will notice. People of faith are
the engineers, scientists, and businessmen and women of this coun-
try. Yet they go to work every day and do what is required of them,
leaving religion to the weekend. This is the crux of the problem.
We have compartmentalized religion and relegated faith to the role
of a part-time hobby. People of faith now need to face themselves
and decide the true place of faith in their lives. With our constitu-
tional guarantees, there should be no public price paid for making
a religious choice. Would such a choice, however, divide us as a na-
tion? That is our next concern.

Civility and the Project of Finding Common Ground

The people of faith and secular humanists who are not tempted
by the promise of dominion and power are likely to have a lot to
talk about. Despite their different worldviews, they share a com-
mitment to democracy, egalitarianism, and mutual respect that
should make their conversations meaningful. When they reach
difficult issues, they are likely to utilize helpful tools, such as further
discussions, principled compromise, mediation, or methods of con-
flict resolution. On the other end of the spectrum, fanatic reli-
gionists and secularists would have difficulty communicating with
each other and the rest of the country by virtue of their fanaticism.
Their perspectives and values are based on domination, whether
intellectual or physical, and domination or the attempt to dominate
engenders conflict.

So for these people there is not much that we can do other than
try to help them see reality and human relations in more egalitar-
ian terms. We can achieve this end through increased public edu-
cation and communication and by example. Our disagreement with
them is not about religion or secularism, rather it is about democ-
racy and power sharing, about how to respect the views of others
and treat them with dignity. In this regard, recent attempts at fos-
tering civil discourse in our public square are very important.

At the heart of the concept of civility lies the principle that we

are all God's creatures, or simply that humans are endowed with dignity. Yet in our earthly existence, we have invented oppressive hierarchies, such as those of race, gender, and wealth, to differentiate us from and privilege us over others. It is these internalized hierarchies, conscious or subconscious, that provide the foundation of uncivil behavior. As members of the human race, we have consistently erected the barriers of stereotypes precisely to avoid knowing each other. When these barriers fall, each one of us will see himself or herself in that alien "other."

Incivility is not a momentary lapse. It is an outer reflection of a deep-seated belief in a system of hierarchies. This system arbitrarily bestows upon or withholds from groups of humans God's greatest gift: dignity. After all, it was God who gave dignity to the children of Adam. It is not bestowed upon us by a government, a race, or a faith. From the poorest to the richest, the youngest to the oldest, our dignity is our divine birthright.

The most oppressive form of incivility, in my view, is civil incivility, polite incivility. This occurs when the words are right but the message is wrong, when someone politely treats another as an inferior "other." This author will share a personal experience as an example. In one instance of polite conversation over coffee, my two companions were so engrossed in their conversation about Muslims that they literally forgot my presence. I guess I was not that important a member of the group to start with. To them, I was subconsciously an inferior "other." It did not require too much intellectual energy for them to first marginalize my presence, and then simply eliminate or forget it. As a result, I had the unusual experience of hearing my friends stereotype Muslims and express concerns to each other about our growing American Muslim community, but all in a very civil fashion.

Eschewing oppressive hierarchies forces us to take others seriously. If we take others seriously, then we must believe in human rights, especially the right to free expression. A view that argues against such rights contradicts my fundamental religious beliefs. Nevertheless, when faced with it, we must draw upon our faith for patience, compassion, and wisdom. We must focus on our common humanity with the other to bring down the barriers. Violence, whether verbal or physical, does not change thought. It merely sup-

presses it temporarily. It only hides pernicious hierarchies; it does not address them.

Each person must have room for his or her thoughts. After all, each person is directly responsible toward God (the Great Spirit, or himself/herself) for them. We also have the civic and religious responsibility to promote the values we believe in. Our faith requires us to help the society we live in be ethical. Balancing these factors, it is clear that we cannot force our values on others. We must respect their humanity, which includes freedom of thought. Hence our duty is to promote a just society in which our voices as well as other voices have a fair opportunity to be heard and in which human dignity and public welfare are carefully balanced and protected. This cannot be achieved without honesty, patience, deliberation, compassion, and even sacrifice. However, if we live by these criteria, we may not agree always, but we will certainly communicate peacefully.

What Can Concerned Citizens Do?

Concerned citizens should stop looking for easy fixes. We are at the cusp of the next millennium, and unless we give careful attention to our constitutional and societal problems, the trajectory of the U.S. rise in world leadership will be very short. To protect our country, we have to act quickly; for regardless of how fast we may act, the dialogue itself will take its own time. This is why we need to begin addressing our problems now. To do that, the following proposals may be helpful.

1. We need to take an honest look at ourselves. As Jesus said, we are quicker to find the speck in the other's eye, before we notice the log in our own eye. We, people of faith, often blame secularists for the moral problems of this country, but many of us are hypocrites who have contributed in some way to this moral decay. Some of us have embezzled funds, others have exploited the sexuality of the innocent or vulnerable, yet others have used religion as a tool for political power. In the end, many citizens have lost confidence in us. We need to earn back that confidence. To do so, we must seriously examine ourselves.

To start dealing with this situation, small neighborhood gather-

ings, high school and university groups, as well as religious congregations could get together in consciousness raising and bridge building meetings. At these meetings, participants could share their personal stories about serious lapses in their own behavior or judgment, lapses that conflict with their religious or moral values. Among these, for example, would be acts of race or gender discrimination, greed, or envy. The aim of the gatherings is to provide a safe zone in which various individuals could speak out honestly without being condemned or judged. The group would provide both support and direction, helping its members overcome their shortcomings by shining the light on them.

2. We need to face the past once and for all in order to reach a true reconciliation. Many argue that since slavery is obsolete, we need not dwell on the past. Generally (though not always), these voices express the point of view of the majority, i.e., those who are not the descendants of slaves. From the point of view of the latter group, there is still a lot to talk about, wounds that have not healed, truths that have not been admitted, consequences that continue to haunt us till this day. This is a festering wound, moral as well as political, in the body of the nation. We cannot cover it up with a band aid.

We need to have the courage to plunge into a national discussion about the truth of what happened then and its continuing effects today. We need to hear a diversity of voices; we need to know how racism today damages others. But we need to conduct this conversation within the framework of reconciliation and healing. To achieve this goal, careful planning for such a national conversation is necessary. Basic principles and strategies that would help launch the conversation constructively and protect it from deteriorating need to be formulated. To do that, it is helpful to examine the work of organizations already engaged in such a conversation on a limited basis.

Furthermore, great strides could be achieved if leading organizations in this country adopt this proposal and take the lead. They can plan and start the dialogue on a limited basis, until a proper formula for an effective and successful conversation has been agreed upon. In time, these organizations should plan to spread the discussion to other groups across the nation.

3. It is alright to bring our faith to all corners of the public square and make our voices heard in every arena. People of faith in law, business, medicine, education, government, and other sectors need to start thinking about how they can integrate their faith into what they do. It is alright to do so; in fact it is healthy. These individuals could also help educate us about how their faith values could inform their discipline.

Once professionals focus on these issues, they may proceed to organize meetings among them to discuss various recommendations. They may even decide to include in those meetings advisors from law, religious studies, and other areas to provide additional input. Ultimately, panels of experts may be formed consisting of people of faith from every walk of life. These panels would help develop policy positions that the rest of us would be willing to support.

For example, how should people of faith feel about the differential in income between CEOs and workers in this country? The answer is not obvious because of the many considerations involved. For one, do we help kill the goose that lays the golden egg by placing moral restrictions on corporate America? Do we care if we kill it? Who suffers the consequences? What are our priorities in this area and why?

Furthermore, if there are good arguments for paying high salaries to CEOs, because "you get what you pay for," why are these arguments confined to the corporate sector and do not cross over to the educational one? Do we not care about our children's education, and thus are not willing to pay for the best teachers, or is the field of education significantly different from that of business? Should education be organized more "efficiently" as a business, or should we be searching for a better system of organization that reflects better values and is applicable to both? These are questions in serious need of study.

4. Diversity is important and we need to express our commitment to it. We do not want a country that imprisons, tortures, or even disadvantages people who are different. The days of discrimination against the Baptists, Catholics, and others are over. We want to make sure that what happened to them does not happen to non-Christian minorities or secularists.

We need to celebrate diversity rather than dread it.

To put it in Jefferson's words:

Let us not be uneasy then about the different roads we may pursue, as believing them the shortest, to that our last abode: but following the guidance of good conscience let us be happy in the hope that, by these different paths, we shall all meet in the end. (letter to Miles King, 1814)

If we make a deep commitment to diversity and freedom of conscience, then there will be greater cohesion among people of diverse beliefs, a broader alliance, a greater willingness to bring religion into the public square, and, generally, a more democratic state.

In this instance, it would be useful to form diverse consciousness raising groups where individuals are free to express their fears to others about discrimination in our society. In particular, I refer to religious minorities. Sometimes, the position of a minority (or even majority) group as to a public matter arises from its fear and not reason. This is not helpful to our nation in the long run. If we open safe channels for discussion, then we could assuage many of these fears. As a result, we will achieve better bases for decision making.

Again, those participating in these groups need to make a commitment to respect the views of others, regardless of how passionately they are opposed to them. Consequently, they would have to agree ahead of time on certain ground rules for civil disagreement. The case of abortion is a good illustration. Clearly, many of us have underestimated the depth of feeling of many on this issue. Participants need to agree on acceptable modes of communication that will give each side a fair opportunity to argue its case to others, and clearly delineate unacceptable behavior. For example, violence is not an acceptable method of communication. Additionally, as Americans, we all agree that our government should not discriminate against any religious view. This perhaps means that the government should be able to extend funding, where appropriate, to all religious (and secular) schools and hospitals, including in the latter case those that do or do not perform abortions, so long as there is no compelling state interest to do otherwise.

5. Our positions must be based on extensive consultation so as not to threaten others but rather make them as comfortable as possible. Consultation is the backbone of

democracy. To preserve cohesion in this country, we need to consult broadly before reaching our conclusions. If difficult issues surface, experts in mediation could help us reach a fair resolution that takes all legitimate interests into account and causes no irreparable harm to any one group.

6. Our public square needs our help to flourish. As people of faith, we have a special responsibility to recognize the state of cynicism and decay that has permeated our society. If we do not deal with it soon, we will no longer have a democracy. For example, campaign finance is a moral issue that people of faith should become passionate about. We need to protect our democracy. How do we do it? Let us study the issue ourselves instead of waiting for others to propose solutions. We have experts at our table who could provide a solution emanating from our moral values. Just denouncing current practices does not help.

We also have media that have gone out of control, repeatedly beaming messages of obscenity, violence, and unabashed consumerism at our children. We need to initiate a serious dialogue about properly balancing First Amendment free speech interests with the interests of society in fostering a civil and morally acceptable public square for our children.

7. We need to foster honesty and adequate and appropriate disclosure in the public square. Many politicians are damaging the democratic underpinnings of this country by manipulating citizens to gain their votes. This has created a state of apathy that threatens to undercut our long tradition of democratic involvement. Citizens need to recapture the initiative from politicians. We can do that in many ways. For one, citizens can initiate an internal dialogue as to the types of disclosure required from politicians running for office, such as a candidate's basic history, positions, and views. They can even develop disclosure guidelines or recommended forms and lay down basic rules of engagement in the political arena, such as a requirement of civility.

This activist approach may have the effect of devaluing sensationalist efforts to invade candidates' privacy, thus opening the door to a broader range of qualified candidates. It would also help citizens make effective and informed comparisons among candidates. It is a sign of our distorted priorities that we require a disclosure

document from companies selling securities on the market but not for politicians selling themselves to attain decision-making positions that could affect every aspect of our lives. If we are concerned about protecting public interest in the case of securities, why should we be any less concerned in the case of elected office?

8. Our position in the world and our role in it must be studied more seriously. Americans are "proud" of being the only superpower in the world. In fact, this is not a privilege but a burden that requires us to fulfill our calling. Unfortunately, our dealings with the world have been less than satisfactory. We have introduced to the world hedonistic values through our tools of communication. We have also made force, coercion, and sanctions building blocks of our foreign policy. As a result, we have developed a very unsympathetic image abroad. People often think that Americans are hedonist heathens. They are totally shocked to know that the Hollywood image of America is not accurate. We are paying real costs for these distortions. We need to improve communication and policy with other nations. We need to face the fact that our nation, which calls for democracy in other countries, in fact supports tyrannical regimes. This level of hypocrisy affects lives abroad and, in turn, creates anger and frustration against us. Terrorism is only one extreme expression of angry helplessness.

We need a panel of experts to study these issues, in part by traveling abroad, by consulting ethnic minorities in this country, and by gathering adequate information.

We also need as a nation to decide whether we are committed to a dialogue of civilizations as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has asserted, or a clash of civilizations as Samuel Huntington has predicted.[32] We need to decide whether we want to usher in New World values of cooperation and community or remain captured by Old World values of conflict and domination. As people of faith, the choice should be easy, but as children of the Industrial Revolution, it may not be. The presence of an ethnically diverse group of participants with different perspectives on this issue should enlighten our discussions.

9. We need to democratize our modes of communication. The Internet has begun to do that, but our traditional modes of communication need to be examined in order to determine the

extent of concentration of ownership, underlying undisclosed interests, inherent bias in data gathering, etc. We need to start a national conversation on this matter. After all, movies, video games, cable television, and regular programing are all commercial ventures that can be affected financially by public opinion. But such results cannot be achieved overnight. Expert panels must study the issues, consult, and initiate a national grassroot conversation in America's cities and towns. If there is no effective competition in these markets, then consumers can choose other strategies for increasing honesty in reporting, decreasing violence in programs and games, and making journalism a better representative of the voice of the people.

10. We need to revitalize our original democratic power. People have forgotten their original democratic power. They have let politicians, corporate entities, and taxes exhaust them. They work these days longer hours and make less money. A family must have two breadwinners to insure a decent standard of living. But many are working poor, elderly without medical insurance, and children with single or no parents. This crisis situation demands exceptional efforts for reformation. As people of faith we are called to corrective action. We need to revive the American spirit of participatory democracy in every community, on every street. For, indeed, if our democracy is at stake, then so is our liberty.

These proposals are all designed to heal the rupture in our society and in our psyches caused by a simplistic mechanistic worldview that has been partly abandoned by science and technology themselves. Open and constructive communication, based on the analysis offered in this article, will help unmask among us faulty assumptions, repressed frustrations, and deep dysfunctions that have gone so far unnoticed. I hope that it will also usher the way to a brighter future more consistent with our American tradition of cooperation, neighborliness, and robust faith.

Notes

[1]As will be argued later, early modern science did not rest on secular assumptions. Furthermore, the mechanistic model had more limited applications.

[2]For more on this new age, see Toffler and Toffler (1994).

[3]See, for example, Easterbrook (1998).

[4]For more on science's political authority and the dangers to democracy, see Lloyd (1996).

[5]See, for example, Kuhn (1970); Scheffler (1967); and Bernstein (1983).

[6]Quoted in Easterbrook (1998), p. 79.

[7]This interest is keenest in the area of medicine, where the power of prayer to heal has been under study. See, for example, "Religiosity and Remission of Depression in Medically Older Patients," *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, April 1998. See also, "Religion, Spirituality, and Medicine," *Lancet*, February 20, 1999, and the response entitled "Do Religion and Spirituality Matter in Health?" *Alternative Therapies in Health and Medicine*, May 1999.

[8]See, for example, Tuana (1996), pp. 17–35. Tuana argues: "What feminist epistemologists have realized is that it is a mistake to ask for a value-free science. . . . Scientific research, as well as all cognitive endeavors, begins with metaphysical and methodological commitments." She also states: "To say that the practice of science is marked by gender and by politics is not the same as claiming that it arises out of wishful thinking or ideological concerns. A scientific theory can provide consistent methods for obtaining reliable knowledge, yet be influenced by certain values or interests. Objectivity and neutrality are not the same thing." Tuana views the feminist critique resulting in alternative evolutionary accounts, such as "woman, the gatherer," not as a feminist "corrective" but as providing "more accurate accounts of the evidence, and . . . therefore the result of better science."

[9]Quoted in Lloyd (1996), p. 238.

[10]Lloyd (1996).

[11]For more on this, see the valuable discussion in Lloyd (1996), pp. 223–224.

[12]For more on this, see the discussion in Lloyd (1996), pp. 224–226.

[13]U.S. medical schools increasingly are offering courses in religion and spirituality. Also, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has funded research in the area of religion, spirituality, and health. For more on this, see Larry Dossey's article in *Alternative Therapies in Health and Medicine*, May 1999.

[14]Azizah al-Hibri, "The American Corporation in the Twenty-First Century: Future Forms of Structure and Governance," *University of Richmond Law Review 31*, December 1997, pp. 1402–1409.

[15]See, for example, "Backlash: Behind the Anxiety Over Globalization," *Business Week*, April 24, 2000, especially p. 40.

[16]See, for example, Mitchell (1995).

[17]For an excellent discussion of this point, see Jean Bethke Elshtain, "How Should We Talk?" *Case Western Reserve Law Review 49*, Summer 1999, pp. 731–746.

[18]See Thieman (1996), especially pp. 168–173.

[19]Witness the heated debate, sometimes resulting in violence, on the issue of abortion.

[20]For separating out the two meanings of "public," namely, the sphere of government versus the nongovernmental sphere of civil society, see Thieman (1996), pp. 151–154. We have used here "governmental" and "civic" to express the distinction.

[21]*Doe v. Santa Fe Independent School District*. The case involved the permissibility of student initiated prayers in football games. The governmental public forum involved in this case was the public school itself. The majority opinion of the Court was troubled by the school policy that it said imposed on the student body a ma-

joritarian election on the issue of prayer. According to the Court, the school district established through this policy a "governmental electoral mechanism that turns the school into a forum for religious debate." The Court noted that "this student election does nothing to protect minority views but rather places the students who hold such views at the mercy of the majority." The dissent, on the other hand, accused the Court's opinion of "bristl[ing] with hostility to all things religious in public life."

²²A good discussion of these approaches and others can be found in Witte (2000). Also see Kathleen A. Brady, "Fostering Harmony Among the Justices: How Contemporary Debates in Theology Can Help to Reconcile the Divisions on the Court Regarding Religious Expression by the State," *Notre Dame Law Review 75,* December 1999, pp. 509–519.

²³See Little (1938), especially pp. 338–353, 168–191, and 53–56. See also, *The Baptists of Virginia 1699–1926* (1955).

²⁴For a recent assessment of the report about the meeting, see Fred Anderson, executive director of the Virginia Baptist Historical Society, "The Leland-Madison Meeting," *Religious Herald,* March 24, 1988, p. 13, and the sequel by the same author, "This Week in Our History," March 31, 1988, p. 12.

²⁵For a detailed discussion of the different articulations of the judicial concepts of "neutrality" and the question of "aid," see Thieman (1996), p. 61.

²⁶Thieman (1996), p. 78.

²⁷Commenting on this frustrating state of affairs, Thieman (1996) offers another critique: "Members of the judicial branch appear to be particularly ill-prepared to engage in even the minimal theological inquiry required to determine the meaning and function of a religious symbol within a religious community's vast network of beliefs and practices. Moreover, such inquiry threatens to place the 'civil magistrate' as a 'judge of religious truth,' a position Madison reckoned to be 'an arrogant pretension.'" p. 50.

²⁸In fact, Justice O'Connor had no problem with the constitutionality of exhibiting a creche on government property when it was combined with secular symbols that negated any impression that the government was endorsing Christianity *(Lynch v. Donnelly).*

²⁹Thieman (1996), pp. 166–167.

³⁰Witte (2000), p. 183.

³¹Marcuse (1966), pp. 86–88. While the author does not subscribe fully to the Marcusian theory, she does recognize important insights in it that are applicable to our analysis. For example, while her definition of Eros tends to be different from that of Marcuse, she nevertheless agrees with him to the extent that he defines Eros as the "life instinct" and a force that binds humanity into a closely knit mass. Eros, as used herein, is thus the love force that binds human beings into family relations and friendships. The concept of "surplus repression," i.e., that repression imposed in our society in the interest of domination, remains unchanged. Under the author's approach, an example of "surplus repression" would be excessive work hours that take parents away from their families in the interest of increasing corporate profits. Interestingly, in pursuing his analysis, Marcuse offers what sounds like a traditional critique of the increased forces of domination in our society. He states: "The technological abolition of the individual is reflected in the decline of the social function of the family. It was formerly the family which, for good or bad, reared and educated the individual, and the dominant rules and values were transmitted personally and transformed through personal fate. . . . Now, however, under the rule

of economic, political, and cultural monopolies, the formation of the mature super-ego seems to skip the stage of individualization: the generic atom becomes directly a social atom. The repressive organization of instincts seems to be *collective*, and the ego seems prematurely socialized by a whole system of extra-familial agents and agencies. As early as the preschool levels, gangs, radio, and television set the pattern for conformity and rebellion; deviations from the pattern are punished not so much within the family as outside and against the family." pp. 96–97.

[32]Madeleine Albright expressed these views in 1999 during an Iftar dinner for Muslim leaders at the State Department. Samuel Huntington has expressed his views in "The Clash of Civilizations?" in *Foreign Affairs 72:3*, Summer 1993, pp. 21–49.