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A healthy and vibrant democracy requires an engaged public—one that includes people of faith.
A Time to Lead

Americans are frustrated with the current state of our public square. Approval ratings of Congress hover around 13%, nearly all Americans believe that people on opposite sides of major issues demonize each other, and 75% feel that it’s the extreme voices that get all the attention. Clearly, now is the moment to lead toward a better future.

But for some time now, an important voice has lost influence in the conversations that define our national identity—conversations about law, morality, justice, culture, and public policy. Those voices belong to people of faith, Christians and non-Christians alike.

Why have these voices lost influence? Some have been intentionally marginalized, because when they held power, they didn’t listen to minority voices. Many have opted out, believing the cultural divide is too great and their voice doesn’t matter—choosing instead not to take part in such discussions. Others are worried about being accused of bigotry or intolerance if they share their convictions openly. Some are concerned that respectful debate may require them to compromise their beliefs. And there are yet others who would like to join in and contribute to these discussions, but simply don’t know how.

This guide is based on Q-commissioned research. It was created for people of faith to know how to participate in—and influence—our rapidly changing cultural landscape.

Why People of Faith Need to Be in the Conversation

People of faith bring wisdom, experience, and compassion to discussions that are often sensitive, complex, and fraught with challenges. Communicating one’s deepest beliefs has never been harder—or more important. A healthy and vibrant democracy requires an engaged public. And a living, breathing, authentic faith requires that it never cave on core conviction while contending in an environment that prioritizes new social norms of being “nice,” “accepting,” “tolerant,” and never “offensive.” The order of the day is to learn how to get along, despite great differences.

The world desperately needs people of faith in the public realm. But who will lead?

This is an invitation to learn and to act. By learning how to engage those with different views, you will be better equipped to act in a way that is both true to your faith and genuinely understanding of the differences that make us who we are as Americans.
Reclaiming Our Voice

We need to be able to articulate how faith strengthens the social fabric, how people of faith contribute to public life, and how their voices enhance the public conversation.
A Nation Divided

All you have to do is glance at news headlines or pull up your social media feed to see that America has become increasingly divided. Public discourse has deteriorated. Politically, socially, and morally, we are fragmenting into fiercely opposed, self-contained tribes.

The polarized media landscape further reflects this state of fragmentation. There are many labels—Left vs. Right, Red States vs. Blue States, Conservative vs. Liberal, Republican vs. Democrat, Religious vs. Secular—for the same underlying reality: people are increasingly locked in echo chambers of their own choosing, unwilling to entertain (or even be exposed to) opposing views. Group identities and ideologies threaten to eclipse our shared national identity.

The Numbers

95% of Americans agree that “people on opposite sides of an issue demonize each other so severely that they make finding common ground impossible.”
When Extremists Take Center Stage

In such a polarized environment, many people of faith are understandably reluctant to let their voices be heard. They hold back a key part of their identity rather than risk being attacked, vilified, or shamed. As the moderate majority retreats, extreme voices receive more attention than they deserve. And when violent extremists take center stage, they are perceived by many as representing all people of faith. The exception is mistaken for the norm, and as a result, 42% of people of faith are thought to be part of the problem instead of part of the solution.

People on all sides of a controversial issue agree that there is an observable trend of shutting down and harassing people with unpopular or conflicting opinions. They don’t believe it should be this way.

Respondents said:

“We have freedom of speech. That doesn’t mean I need to accept that opinion, but they can hold it.”

“Just because someone doesn’t agree with you doesn’t make them a hate group.”

“If we’re afraid of being castigated, that’s going to [keep] us from speaking and coming up with ideas.”

The Numbers

More than half of all Americans (53%) feel that society today is less tolerant of different ideas and opinions than it used to be.

At the same time, over two-thirds of Americans (68%) believe that society benefits from having a diversity of opinions and viewpoints, because variety and debate lead to the best ideas and solutions for our common future.
How Do Voices of Faith Enhance Public Discourse?

For people of faith to return to the public conversation, several requirements need to be met:

First, we need to be able to articulate how faith strengthens the social fabric, how people of faith contribute to public life, and how their voices enhance the public conversation.

Second, we need to understand the obstacles that inhibit people of faith from fully participating in the public square.

Third, we need to understand how to empower and encourage people of faith to contribute constructively to the common good in a way that reflects their deeply held convictions.

The Numbers

Few Americans are aware of the size and scope of what people of faith contribute to society—from health and medicine to adoption and education services.

Accordingly, practically half of all Americans (49%) believe that good works would continue even if there were no people of faith and no religious organizations to do them. This couldn’t be further from the truth.
A Strong Demand for Moderate Voices of Faith

People want the tone of the conversation to change. Many want to participate more fully in the political and cultural processes that require active, ongoing engagement—processes which strengthen society and help overcome divisiveness and mistrust.

There is a broad and deeply felt desire for virtue to be re-established—and restoring moderate, faith-driven perspectives to the public square is part of that solution. Before we examine how to make that happen, we first need to understand the challenges involved.

75% of people agree with the statement that “we should stop letting the people on the extreme ends of the issues dominate the discussion on important issues and put more faith and emphasis on more moderate voices on each side of the issues to find common ground.”

The Numbers
Diminished participation in the public square among people of faith is due to a variety of factors, including changes in the religious landscape, the emergence of a self-focused morality, and a shift in what is considered “extremist” religious behavior.
Why Are Faithful Viewpoints Often Underrepresented?

It is no accident that many voices of faith are no longer being heard in the public square. Let’s examine the major reasons why moderate religious viewpoints are often inadequately represented in public discourse.

Many religious people feel a deep sense of distrust from the larger society. A perception of decreasing religious freedom is one of the indicators of that distrust.

The Numbers

- 54% Misunderstood
- 52% Persecuted
- 44% Marginalized
- 40% Sidelined
- 38% Silenced
- 31% Afraid to speak up
- 23% Afraid to look stupid

Many people of faith in America feel a sense of distrust from society, and even fear, on account of their beliefs.
Amid the changes occurring across the American religious landscape, several recent trends are worth noting: one is the dramatic rise of the “nones”—those who claim no religious affiliation. Another is the increase, even among religious adherents, of a diffuse spirituality—a loosely formed mysticism which lacks any core conviction and aligns with no particular faith group. These trends affect both the perception and practice of traditional religiosity.

Recent trends indicate a striking increase in the percentage of Americans in the religiously unaffiliated category, and a decline in the percentage of adults who identify as Christian.
Weakening Religious Commitments

Another noteworthy trend is the **general decline in religious involvement** in the United States. Fewer children participate in religious activities than in previous years. Fewer young people and adults self-identify as religious. And the percentage of Americans who have never attended religious services has increased.

These trends partly reflect a broader demographic shift, as married couples with children—typically one of the most religiously involved demographic groups—are shrinking as a proportion of American society. As sociologist Mark Chaves has noted, every indicator of traditional religiosity is either steady or in decline.

Millennials, in particular (those born between 1981 and 1996), are much less likely than older Americans to consider religion of any kind important.

The Numbers

American adults provide divergent descriptions when asked about the religious state of the country.
Unsurprisingly, such significant changes in religious affiliation, behavior, and identity have consequences for the moral codes that broadly reflect society’s values. Sociologist Robert Wuthnow calls the new moral code “DIY [Do It Yourself] morality.” It is characterized by a new focus on the self, as indicated by a slew of new terms that entered public discourse in the 1960s (such as self-acceptance, self-esteem, and self-expression).

That focus on the self is clearly evident among today’s youth, whose “de facto dominant religion,” to quote another leading sociologist, Christian Smith, is what he calls “Moralistic Therapeutic Deism.” In this religion, the central goal of life is “to be happy and feel good about oneself.” Such a worldview leaves little room for moral absolutes or overarching truths.

Nearly half of all Americans reject the idea that moral absolutes exist.
Declining Confidence in Leaders and Institutions

For a variety of reasons, including misbehavior by clergy, Americans’ confidence in organized religion has steadily declined in recent decades. (Aside from the military, this decline in trust applies to a broad swath of organizations and institutions.)

As a result, religious leaders and organizations are often not seen as offering guidance or insight that would apply to real-world issues from the political or social realms.

Americans’ degree of confidence in organized religion has suffered a serious decline in recent years.
Is Faith Part of the Problem?

Perhaps the biggest challenge of all is the widespread perception that people of faith, and the systems of belief and practice they represent, are themselves part of the problem. In this view, it doesn’t matter what a person of faith does or does not personally believe, or how that person acts in public or private. Evoking a religious belief or practice can quickly trigger negative assumptions and hinder constructive conversation.

The Numbers

42% of Americans believe that “people of faith”—and an even higher figure, 46%, believe that “religion”—are part of the problem, not the solution, when it comes to significant issues and the direction of the country.
Shifting the Boundaries of “Extremism”

This surprisingly negative impression of people of faith (and of religion itself) is due in part to a small number of extremists who have attached themselves to a few pet causes and have publicly acted in an ungenerous, uncharitable way. The actions of a few have had an enormous negative impact on the perception of entire communities of people of faith.

This shift in perspective, combined with the changing moral and religious trends discussed earlier, have led us to a situation where a wide spectrum of behavior is now considered “extremist.”

Once faith is defined as socially extreme, the culture believes it has a moral obligation to block those views from the public square.

If these are the many challenges facing people of faith who want to reclaim their voices in the public square, then what are the solutions?

The Numbers

A wide spectrum of religious behavior is considered “extreme” by many Americans.

- 75%
- 64% Protesting government in the name of religion
- 63% Refusing to provide a service for a same-sex wedding
- 56% Stating that homosexuality is a sin
- 47% Opposing same-sex marriage
- 43% Voting against same-sex marriage
- 35% Adhering to a special diet for religious reasons
- 28% Donating a percentage of one’s income as an act of faith and obedience
- 27% Refusing to drink alcohol, smoke, or take drugs for religious reasons
- 21% Wearing an article of clothing for religious reasons
- 17% Inviting someone to a religious service
- 12% Volunteering in a food kitchen every week
- 10%

12% Volunteering in a food kitchen every week
10%
When discussing sensitive cultural topics, emphasizing religious doctrine can lead to the conversation shutting down entirely. The issue is not the doctrine; it's the tone and style of communication.
Tone Matters as Much as Substance

LEADING A NEW CONVERSATION

If people of faith are at risk of being associated with socially destructive, extremist views as soon as they open their mouths or signal a religious affiliation of any kind, clearly a new approach is needed.

Because of widespread negative assumptions about religion, emphasizing religious doctrine can risk shutting down the conversation entirely. It is only natural and instinctive for a person of faith to defend cherished beliefs and the sources of his or her faith. But defending convictions, however well-intentioned, can easily backfire in this age of suspicion toward religiosity of all kinds.

The issue is not the doctrine; instead, it’s the tone, method, and style of communication. Paying more attention to these attributes of discourse has the potential of radically changing the outcomes of our conversations.

The Numbers

LEADING A NEW CONVERSATION

Over 80% of people believe that the way controversial issues are handled can have an effect on the outcome of the conversation.

Younger Americans reject the dominant tone of rancor that characterizes contemporary politics. Nearly half of all millennials believe that “politics has become too partisan.”
Reducing Skepticism Toward Faithful Viewpoints

Many Americans have an intense skepticism toward all things religious. Because of this, we need to engage in the public square in a different way.

A new approach needs to be both true to the mind and life of faith and be able to address the challenges of our time. We need to break through the skepticism and strengthen the positive perception of people of faith. That will open doors and remove obstacles to participating in public discourse. What, specifically, can we do?

The Numbers

A variety of traits—both positive and negative—are associated with people of faith.
Ways to Take Action

Do good works.

Nothing strengthens religion’s social capital more than contributing to society by assisting those in need and performing other acts of charity. Individual and communal acts of kindness and selflessness transcend boundaries and facilitate a positive association with people of faith. People of faith also have a significant capacity to add value to society by fostering hope, values, and a sense of purpose.

The Numbers

Religious organizations and individual believers contribute many types of “good works” to American society. The above activities are ranked by the importance given to them by survey respondents.
Among the themes of “good works” performed by a religious group or person, “love” and “doing what’s right” leave the strongest positive impressions.

Ways to Take Action

Tell stories of faith’s positive impact.

People of faith are often reluctant to talk about their contributions to society. While such humility is admirable, good works that don’t find their way into shareable stories end up having less impact. Nor can silent good works help to counteract the common-but-false assumption that the country wouldn’t suffer if people of faith and religious organizations discontinued their public involvement.

Such stories typically have common themes, they emphasize the impact on an individual, and they create an emotional connection.

The Numbers

Among the themes of “good works” performed by a religious group or person, “love” and “doing what’s right” leave the strongest positive impressions.
Ways to Take Action

Find common ground.

Regardless of the issue or conversation partner, there is almost always some common ground between people who take a different view on contemporary issues. Finding and building on that shared space can have profound consequences. Doing so requires paying as much attention to one’s tone and style of communication as to the substance of the issues under discussion. With the right approach, the extent of common ground discovered is often surprising.

Even amid the sharp divisions that characterize contemporary America, there are areas of widespread agreement. For example, a broad consensus supports the following statements:

1. All people deserve love, respect, and charity.
2. Tolerance of differences is important.
3. Political leadership alone will not solve society’s problems.
4. America is a religiously pluralistic country.

The Numbers

Which is more important to Americans: to defend core principles, or to be charitable and tolerant to everyone? 60% of survey respondents chose the latter.
On controversial topics, sharing a dogmatic statement—such as: “Gay marriage is wrong” may reflect one’s honest beliefs, but is more likely to shut down a conversation with someone of a different viewpoint.

But when phrasing one’s opinions more respectfully, and with greater concern for the other person’s views, like this:

“I try to do and say what I believe is right, and I believe that gay marriage is wrong. But I am interested in learning why you disagree.”

Americans are three times more likely to continue the conversation.
A crucial element of productive conversations is showing respect for one another. In fact, Americans consider being respectful even more important than finding common ground.

**A Simple Guide to Better Conversation**

**1. Practice the Golden Rule**
Show respect and demonstrate an interest in finding areas of shared interest and concern.

**2. Seek Similarities**
Look for areas of commonality and agreement.

**3. Own Your Opinion**
Offer relevant, personal examples that indicate you have thought about the issues at hand and aren’t just citing tradition (perceived as rigid dogma) or what others have taught you.

**4. Listen Actively**
Summarize what you hear the other person saying to see if you really understand.

**5. Ask What the Other Person Thinks**
Ask and care what others think and how they feel.

**6. Disagree with Respect**
Acknowledge and be respectful of genuine differences.

**The Numbers**

A crucial element of productive conversations is showing respect for one another. In fact, Americans consider being respectful even more important than finding common ground.
Organizations play a powerful role in every realm of the modern world. Judiciously deploying an organization’s resources can be a powerful vehicle for shaping the public square.
How Can Organizations Wisely Engage in the Public Square?

So far, we have defined the new cultural and religious landscape and have offered concrete, evidence-based recommendations for how people of faith can continue to make themselves heard. But how does all of this apply to religious organizations and institutions? How should they respond to the current challenges of and opportunities for participating in the public square?

Many of the recommendations mentioned thus far apply to both individuals and organizations. Understanding the cultural environment will help organizations adapt the message while staying true to core principles. In this context, too, tone matters a great deal, given the speed of communication and the reach of media.

How does religious freedom affect businesses and other organizations? More than 1/3 of Americans believe that businesses deserve to be boycotted, harassed, or even shut down if they hold unpopular views. Nearly a quarter of Americans believe that people of faith should be harassed or silenced for their views.
Legal and Policy Implications

The Numbers

THE ROLE OF RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

However, there are also differences in how individuals and organizations should face the challenges of public engagement. Many legal and policy implications, for example, will apply to organizations but not to individuals. Running afoul of regulations can lead to serious consequences, such as losing public funding or tax-exempt status. The challenge of adapting to changing laws and rules may also lead to disruptions caused by public relations crises or objections from employees, donors, investors, or parishioners.

While issues surrounding LGBT rights and reproductive rights often dominate discussions on religious freedom, the concept goes much deeper. Freedom of conscience is a founding principle of the United States and is enshrined in the First Amendment of the Constitution. It is also defended, in the 1948 U.N. Declaration on Human Rights, as a universal right to which all people everywhere have claim.

So it’s important to resist any narrow framing of religious freedom as applying solely or primarily to specific cultural issues. It is, instead, part of the foundation of Western society.

2:1

Among Americans who’ve recently heard a news story about religious freedom, negative stories outweighed positive ones by a ratio of more than 2:1.

1/3

Over one-third of Americans (35%) believe that religious freedom is not protected enough in the United States.

News stories Americans associate with freedom of religion:

- 10% importance of freedom of religion
- 9% ISIS activities
- 8% Hobby Lobby, birth control case
- 8% Christians sentenced to death internationally
- 7% America in decline or under threat
- 7% Government healthcare regulations, birth control
- 6% Students suspended for saying “Bless You”
Three Steps: Embrace, Educate, Engage

The Numbers

Embrace the opportunity to affect meaningful cultural change.
Organizations play a powerful role in every realm of our world. Judiciously deploying an organization’s resources can be a powerful vehicle for shaping the public square.

Educate your leadership, team members, and others in your circle of influence.
Religious freedom requires an equal playing field for all beliefs, without preference given to any one faith or group. Support the idea and practice of pluralism, since it underlies the protections offered to all religious organizations. Educate your teams on constructive dialogue.

Engage in the civic sphere.
Be part of the solution. Tell stories of good works inspired by faith. Don’t sow division or create “us vs. them” scenarios that only deepen existing feelings of suspicion or mistrust. Assess the legal risks. Participate in public discussions on relevant laws and policies.

If you don’t tell the story of your organization’s impact, who will? Practically half of all Americans (49%) believe that the amount of service and charitable work in the US would not decline if all religious organizations ceased to exist.
The twenty-first century requires of believers a willingness to adopt winsome methods of engagement amid an environment of suspicion and skepticism.
Participation in public conversation matters. In a democracy, culture is collectively forged through voluntary interactions with other people and their ideas. For people of faith to feel marginalized—or retreat from—public discussion has deep and lasting consequences. It limits the potential of the public square to represent people’s hearts and minds. It also reduces the positive contributions that people of faith make to society.

This book has offered a practical, data-driven approach, based on quantitative and qualitative research, for expanding the circle of conversation. It has made the case for bringing people of faith, as well as organizations, back into full participation in public discourse.

Religious pluralism is here to stay. Twenty-first century realities ask of believers a willingness to adopt winsome methods of engagement amid an environment of suspicion and skepticism toward religion.

Faith is too important to be omitted from the public and private interactions that knit us together as a country. Even though we are a diverse, imperfect nation, much is to be gained from faithful conversations that acknowledge current realities and seek a better way forward.
A Brief Note About Research Methods

CONCLUSION

The data that underlies the findings presented in this book derives from two kinds of research: traditional telephone surveys and new qualitative techniques that emerged in the course of research. Among these new techniques are “triads,” or small groups of three people. Researchers found that triads allowed for greater openness and ease of conversation, essential attributes for understanding the dynamics of talking about sensitive topics. Researchers also borrowed techniques from other fields, like marriage counseling, as they explored how role reversal might increase empathy among people with different viewpoints. The results of the triad conversations helped shape subsequent survey questions and informed the direction of the research.

While the majority of religious adherents in the United States today are Christian, this book, and the research it represents, cut across denominational and faith-specific lines.
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