



An Act of Faith: Opening Public Coffers to Religious Organizations

An Analysis of President Bush's Faith-Based Initiative

Introduction

Over the years, numerous arguments have been advanced in favor of permitting public funds to be used to support components of sectarian educational and social service programs. Many of these arguments appeal to fairness. Some even appear, at least superficially, to have an element of common sense. Nonetheless, invariably, these arguments fail to overcome fundamental problems with constitutionality and public policy. For this reason, the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) has consistently opposed the use of public funds to support any component of a program that has a pervasive religious content.

President Bush's Faith Based Initiative (F-BI) is the newest effort to secure public funding for social service and education programs that have religious content. The President implies that his proposal breaks new ground in creating partnerships between government and faith-based charitable service groups. However, such partnerships are not new. Many religious organizations (e.g. Lutheran Services in America, Catholic Charities, the Salvation Army) have a long history of such partnerships.¹

What *is* new about the President's proposal is the effort to expand partnerships between government and *pervasively religious* charities. Whereas, the faith-

based organizations historically involved in government partnerships have been able to separate the social service functions from the religious activities of the organization, pervasively religious charities cannot separate these two elements.

Despite the careful packaging of the President's Faith-Based Initiative, serious problems with constitutionality and public policy appear intrinsic to major elements of the proposal. FCNL will continue to oppose those components, which threaten both the free exercise and establishment clauses of the First Amendment and which violate sound public policy.

Before looking specifically at the F-BI, we offer a brief review and analysis of prior efforts to secure public funding for social service programs with pervasive religious content.

¹ The terms "faith-based organization" and "religious organization" are used interchangeably to refer to any organization that is motivated by faith, is affiliated with a faith tradition, or incorporates religion in its activities. The terms thus describe organizations that run the gamut from houses of worship to separately incorporated non-profits.



The **Friends Committee on National Legislation** (FCNL), a Quaker lobby in the public interest, seeks to follow the leadings of the Spirit as it speaks for itself and for like-minded Friends. Views expressed in *FCNL Perspectives* are guided by the Statement of Legislative Policy which is prepared and approved by FCNL's General Committee. FCNL includes Friends appointed by 26 Friends' yearly meetings and by seven other Friends' organizations in the United States.

Clerk: Jonathan Fisch

Assistant Clerk: Joanne Rains

Executive Secretary: Joe Volk

The *FCNL Perspectives* is sent free upon request. Your contributions are needed to support FCNL's lobbying and education work.

Author: Florence C. Kimball

Editor: Florence C. Kimball

Document Number: G-01-010D

Reprinting items from the *FCNL Perspectives*:

We encourage our readers to copy and distribute the *FCNL Perspectives* or to quote sections of the *FCNL Perspectives*. When doing so, please include the following credit:

"Reprinted from the *FCNL Perspectives*, [month and year] published by the Friends Committee on National Legislation."

We would appreciate receiving a copy with a brief note indicating how/where the item was used and the approximate number of copies distributed.

Friends Committee on National Legislation

245 Second Street NE

Washington, DC 20002-5795

Phone: 202-547-6000

Toll free: 800-630-1330

Fax: 202-547-6019

Legislative Action Message:

202-547-4343

email: fcnl@fcnl.org

web site: <http://www.fcnl.org>

Printed on recycled paper with soy-based ink.



Public Funding of Parochial School Systems

For decades, some denominations that operate parochial school systems have argued that public money should be permitted to fund the purchase of textbooks for secular subjects such as math, English, and history. Advocates of such funding point out that parochial school systems perform a public service in educating children. They note that, were parochial systems to shut their doors, considerable public funds would need to be spent to build additional public schools and hire teachers to serve the students currently served by the parochial system.

It is impossible to deny that, to the extent that parochial schools teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, they perform a function that is identical to that performed by the public schools. It is equally undeniable that parochial schools perform this function using text books that may advance their religious teaching (for example, through arithmetic word problems that draw upon religious practices). Allowing public funds to be used to purchase textbooks that even subtly advance a particular faith puts government in the position of furthering those religious teachings. Such a position has, heretofore, been interpreted by most constitutional scholars as being impermissible under the First Amendment's establishment clause.

Ultimately, money is fungible, that is, interchangeable. Public funds provided to a parochial school for the purchase of textbooks in secular subjects expand the overall budget of that school. Since the mission of such a school is to provide education within the framework of that faith's world-view, any public funds serve to promote the teaching of that faith-based world-view, in conflict with the establishment clause.

Moreover, whereas the public school system is subject (however imperfectly) to community input in the choice of textbooks and other matters through the school board and its public meetings, no comparable system of public accountability exists for parochial systems. Nor should there be. Subjecting religiously-affiliated schools to such community input could undermine the unique religious flavor of the instruction and thus infringe on the free exercise of religion. This could be a particular problem for denominations that are a minority in the community. Yet, channeling public funds without requiring public accountability flies in the face of good policy.



Charitable Choice

What is “charitable choice”? The 1996 welfare overhaul legislation (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act) includes a provision (section 104) that permits public funds to be used for religiously-oriented social service programs that provide services within the framework of the legislation. Wording contained in sec. 104, termed charitable choice, provides a new twist in the debate over public funding of religiously-oriented programs.²

Sec. 104 mandates the eligibility of religious organizations to receive public funds on an equal basis with other private organizations. The basis for this mandate is “non-discrimination against religious organizations.” The provision implies that a state’s refusal to contract with sectarian social service programs, even those with pervasive religious content, would constitute an impermissible *discrimination against religion*. While sec. 104 stipulates that public funds cannot be used for “sectarian worship, instruction or proselytization,” it also stipulates that the “religious character” of the organization cannot be “impaired” as a condition of accepting funding.

Does the refusal to publicly fund pervasively religious social service programs constitute discrimination against religion? We at FCNL do not think so. We have consistently opposed charitable choice language each time efforts have been made to incorporate it into legislation.³

As noted previously, many denominationally-sponsored social service programs have, for years prior to

charitable choice, been eligible for public funds.^{4,5} These faith-based charities have all separated religious content from the delivery of an array of social services, that include, among others, care for children and the elderly, settlement of new immigrants, construction of affordable housing, substance abuse programs and halfway homes.

The central issue in charitable choice is *not*, as its sponsors claim, discrimination against all programs sponsored by religious groups. Rather, the issue is the use of public funds to support programs that have a pervasive religious content. A church-sponsored program that simply provides beneficiaries with skills to find and hold a job has long been eligible for public support on an equal footing with secular community organizations that sponsor such programs. However, charitable choice language would broaden the eligibility to permit public funding for church-sponsored programs that incorporate religious principles into the training process. Such public funding, we believe, should not be permitted for both constitutional and public policy reasons.

- Public funding of programs with sectarian content furthers those particular religious teachings in much the same way that the purchase of math textbooks with a parochial flavor furthers the teachings of that denomination. A church-sponsored job training program that draws its instructional points from the Judeo-Christian scriptures is advancing those teachings over the teachings of the Koran and other sacred writings.

² The terms “charitable choice” and “sec. 104” are used interchangeably in the discussion which follows.

³ In addition to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act, the following three laws also include charitable choice provisions: the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1998 (applied to community services block grants), the Children’s Health Act of 2000 (applied to drug abuse treatment programs administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration), and the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000 (applied to drug abuse and prevention programs).

⁴ The *Washington Post* (Sunday, February 18, 2001, p. B3) reported that the three largest faith-based providers receiving government funding are (1) Lutheran Services in America (39% of a \$7 billion annual budget, or \$2.7 billion, comes from government sources), (2) Catholic Charities (62% of 2.3 billion budget, or \$1.4 billion), and (3) the Salvation Army (18% of \$2.1 billion, or \$0.4 billion).

⁵ The *New York Times* (Tuesday, February 20, 2001, p. A1) reported that the International Society for Krishna Consciousness (or Hare Krishnas) have, for nearly 20 years, received millions of dollars in government contracts to run a network of services in Philadelphia.



- Tax dollars that support the social service elements of religious programs free up organizational funds to support proselytization and outreach. Under charitable choice, Jewish taxpayers might be dismayed to find their taxes supporting programs with anti-Semitic content. Some Christian taxpayers might be dismayed to find their taxes supporting Wiccan religious practices. The language in sec. 104 that prohibits the use of taxpayer dollars for "sectarian worship, instruction or proselytization" is more cosmetic than real.
- Religious organizations are exempt from employment non-discrimination laws (section 702 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964). This exemption allows religious organizations to make hiring decisions on the basis of religious principles when those positions serve the faith community. We at FCNL support this exemption as it is important in maintaining the independence of religious organizations free from inappropriate government interference.

The exemption from employment non-discrimination laws may carry over to hiring for social service-type programs that have pervasive religious content. For example, a church-run substance abuse program that consists primarily of Bible study might only hire "counselors" who are members of the denomination. So long as the program is a privately funded part of a ministry that serves the faith community, FCNL supports the exemption.

However, a problem arises under charitable choice. Pervasively religious social service programs that serve clients from outside the faith community now may be eligible for public funding. Permitting the exemption from non-discrimination laws could create a situation in which a fully-qualified substance abuse counselor who is Muslim or Jewish might be ineligible to apply for a publicly funded position in a program run by a Christian denomination. Similarly, otherwise qualified Christians might be ineligible for positions in programs run by Muslims, and so on. We at FCNL believe that the government should not fund programs that engage in discriminatory employment practices.

- The beneficiaries of social service programs do not always participate voluntarily. Sometimes their involvement is mandated by judges as a condition of probation or as an alternative to juvenile detention. If social service programs with a pervasive religious content are included on a referral list of approved programs, an individual could find her or himself participating in a program whose teachings violate the individual's religious beliefs. Sec. 104 does include a provision that permits a beneficiary to object to a placement and that requires the state to provide the beneficiary with an alternative placement. However, sec. 104 does not require that beneficiaries be informed of their right to object and to receive alternate placement. Thus, in practical terms, charitable choice could erode the religious freedom of some beneficiaries.



The Faith-Based Initiative

Pres. Bush unveiled his Faith-Based Initiative (F-BI) at the end of January 2001 in a document entitled "Rallying the Armies of Compassion."⁶ The centerpiece of the proposal is charitable choice. The F-BI also established a White House office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives whose purpose is to expand opportunities for faith-based and other community organizations to meet social needs. Finally, the F-BI proposes a program of tax code and other legislative changes intended to stimulate individual and corporate donations to charities.

Charitable choice. The Faith-Based Initiative dresses up charitable choice in new rhetoric. Pres. Bush cites the diverse and sometimes unique contributions that religiously-oriented social service programs have made to the well-being of U.S. society. In announcing the F-BI, the President made a special attempt to secure the support of African-American churches, many of which offer leadership in community-based social service programs.

There is no arguing that, to the extent that religious organizations feed the hungry, shelter the homeless, and in countless other ways serve the poor and vulnerable in our society, they are contributing to society. There is also convincing evidence that, in some arenas such as rehabilitating persons with substance abuse problems or those who have committed crimes, a spiritual approach may be particularly effective. That religiously-affiliated organizations, including those sponsored by inner-city Black churches, are providing significant help in meeting these needs testifies both to the commitment of these organizations and to the inadequacy of the public response through government at all levels.

None of these arguments, alone or in combination, alleviates any of the constitutional and policy problems (cited previously) that are intrinsic to charitable choice. Providing public funds to social service programs which have pervasive religious content — regardless of the social benefits which the program

may foster — threatens both the free exercise and establishment clauses of the First Amendment as well as accountability in the use of public funds.

In an era of greatly expanded charitable choice, such as Pres. Bush envisions, the question of what constitutes a religious organization for the purposes of funding likely will have to be faced. Will religions that preach hate be eligible for federal funding? Who will decide what religious messages are or are not acceptable? The potential for government intrusion into religious matters is great.⁷

Establishing a White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. The new office has been charged with developing and implementing the Administration's policy agenda with respect to faith-based and other community programs that serve community needs. This mandate translates into, among other things, ensuring the broad implementation of charitable choice.

Concurrent with the establishment of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Pres. Bush also ordered the heads of the Departments of Justice, Education, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Housing and Urban Development to establish within each of their respective departments a Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. These centers are charged with ensuring each department's compliance with the Administration's policy agenda, including charitable choice.

⁶ "Rallying the Armies of Compassion" is available on the White House web site at <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/reports/faithbased.html>>.

⁷ The *New York Times* (Tuesday, February 20, 2001, p. A1) reported that several organizations outside the mainstream religious community, including the Church of Scientology and Sun Myung Moon's church (now called the Family Federation for World Peace and Unification U.S.A.), may seek federal funds. Shortly thereafter, the *Washington Post* (Thursday, February 22, 2001, p. A5) reported that Christian Coalition head Pat Robertson had publicly criticized the Bush proposal because of the possibility that government funds could go to the Church of Scientology, the Unification Church, and the Hare Krishnas. Meanwhile, the earlier *New York Times* article reported that the Anti-Defamation League (a Jewish organization) has been lobbying the administration "behind the scenes" to ensure that government funding would not go to programs run by "the Nation of Islam, whose leader, Louis Farrakhan, has a history of anti-Semitic statements."



We at FCNL do not support the mandate of the White House "Office" and the Department "Centers" with respect to charitable choice. However, we do recognize that government may cooperate with religious social service providers (including pervasively religious organizations) in many *non-financial* ways without running afoul of church-state separation issues. To the extent that such support fosters governmental neutrality toward religion, it may be beneficial. Following are a few examples of possible non-financial cooperation between government and faith-based and community organizations.

- A government office may compile a list of social service providers (for example, homeless shelters, soup kitchens, job training programs, or substance abuse programs) in a town or district. Such a list could include both secular and faith-based providers. Annotations might describe the nature of each program, including religious content.
- A government office might offer education and training opportunities for staff and volunteers of both secular and faith-based programs. For example, a knowledge of public health procedures for organizations that run soup kitchens and homeless shelters is important regardless of whether the sponsoring organization is religious or secular.
- A government office might encourage the business community to develop partnerships with social service providers in the community as a way of developing additional financial resources for social service programs. In providing information to the business community about social service providers, the office could do so evenhandedly, so that businesses are aware of the full range of secular and faith-based providers in the community.

Expanding charitable giving. The underlying premises of this element of the President's proposal are that "America's nonprofit sector will emerge as perhaps the most dynamic arena for creative problem solving in the 21st Century" and that government should encourage successful businessmen and women to create or adopt local charities.⁸ Although, as yet, no legislative language has been drafted for

any of the President's proposals, enough is known about some of the proposals to permit analysis and comment.

- Pres. Bush has proposed expanding the federal charitable deduction to 80 million taxpayers who do not itemize. In December 1999, then-Gov. Bush introduced his proposal for a non-itemizer deduction in a paper entitled "A Tax Cut with a Purpose." The Bush proposal would permit all taxpayers who do not itemize deductions, when computing federal income taxes, to deduct 100% of their charitable contributions, up to the amount of the standard deduction applicable to the taxpayer's filing status.

The Bush proposal is similar to (but actually goes farther than) the Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act which was introduced with strong bipartisan support in the 106th Congress.⁹ Some groups that oppose charitable choice on constitutional grounds *support* this type of proposal as a way to provide additional funds to faith-based charities (including those with pervasive religious content) *without* running afoul of First Amendment constraints.

A recent analysis¹⁰ of the Bush proposal has estimated that, for the year 2000, such a deduction would have stimulated \$14.6 billion in additional charitable giving, an increase of 11.2% over the present level. The analysis also estimated that such a deduction would have increased the number of new givers by about 12 million taxpayers or 17%.

The proposal to allow a charitable deduction for non-itemizers would be expected to benefit lower-income taxpayers preferentially. Currently, 88% of taxpayers with incomes under \$40,000 do not itemize and, potentially,

⁸ "Rallying the Armies of Compassion," p. 10.

⁹ The Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act which would have permitted non-itemizers to deduct only half of their contributions above \$500.

¹⁰ "Incentives for Nonitemizers to Give More: An Analysis" was prepared by the consulting firm PricewaterhouseCoopers for the organization Independent Sector and released January 2001. The report is available on the Independent Sector web site <www.independentsector.org>.



could benefit from this proposal. In contrast, only 14% of taxpayers with incomes above \$70,000 do not currently itemize. This proposal, thus, has the potential to contribute to greater equity in the tax code.

- The President has also proposed permitting persons over age 59 to use Individual Retirement Account (IRA) money to contribute to charities without having to pay income tax on those IRA withdrawals (charitable IRA rollover). This proposal also appeared in a more restricted form in the 106th Congress.¹¹ Like the non-itemizer charitable deduction, this proposal may offer a mechanism to increase private funding for faith-based charities without violating First Amendment principles.
- Another element of Pres. Bush's proposal would encourage states to provide a tax credit for contributions to charities that address poverty and its impact. The credit would be up to 50% of the first \$500 contributed by individuals and up to 50% of the first \$1000 for married couples and corporations. States would be permitted to offset the costs of the charitable state tax credit by using money from the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) welfare program. This proposal raises a number of very serious concerns.

Each state would have to identify the anti-poverty charities that would qualify donors for the special tax credit. The very process of having to identify qualifying charities would place administrative burdens on the state governments. Moreover, by identifying a subset of charities in this way, a state government could, inappropriately, influence private giving choice (by making donations to anti-poverty groups financially more appealing than donations to medical research, conservation, or the arts). The state could also be in the position of discriminating among different anti-poverty charities.

¹¹ The proposal in the 106th Congress would have permitted a "charitable IRA rollover" only for donors who had reached age 70.

The use of welfare funds to offset the charity tax credit would redirect funds that had been appropriated by Congress for assisting needy families. Since the President did not suggest that any new TANF funds would be available, the net effect of this offsetting mechanism could be to take funds away from families in dire need in order to fund some anti-poverty programs. Funding effective anti-poverty programs is important but should not come at the expense of the safety net that protects the most vulnerable in our society.

- The President has proposed raising the cap on corporate charitable deductions from 10% to 15% of the company's taxable income. Since most companies presently do not donate even 10% of their taxable income, it is difficult to see how this proposal would significantly enhance charitable giving. The President would also limit the liability of corporations that, in good faith, donate equipment, facilities, or vehicles to charitable organizations. The implications of this element of the proposal are not yet clear.
- Finally, Pres. Bush has proposed creating a "compassion capital fund" which would match private giving with Federal dollars for the purposes of (1) increasing the technical assistance to help small community and faith-based charities increase their capacity, improve their competence, and expand their programs, and (2) providing start-up capital to enable smaller groups to expand or emulate model programs.

Government support for technical assistance and capacity-building is an appealing idea. However, a major issue here will be the question of what organizations would qualify for public funds. Expanding the capacity of pervasively religious programs or funding the development of additional programs modeled on a pervasively religious program would present some of the same constitutional problems as charitable choice.



Additional Concerns

No new government funds. Thus far, the Administration has said nothing about providing additional public funds for faith-based social service programs. In effect, what the President appears to be proposing is to increase the pool of organizations applying for the current level of funds. This could mean that experienced, effective providers of social service programs, including faith-based providers such as Lutheran Services in America and Catholic Charities, will find their funding reduced as government funds are redirected to pervasively religious providers. Such a consequence could have a dire impact on people who rely on existing programs.

The failure to deal with root causes. Programs that feed the hungry, clothe the naked, shelter the homeless, and minister to those who are sick or in prison are essential. It is barbaric to allow individuals and families to suffer when we, as a society, have the means to alleviate some of that suffering.

However, soup kitchens, homeless shelters, and prison ministries are but band-aids for a wounded society. They staunch the worst of the blood flow, but do not address the underlying problems that created the wounds in the first place.

The widespread poverty, drug abuse, and crime in the U.S. have roots in a social system and a society that are fundamentally violent. The ready availability of guns and the popular media culture are only the more visible manifestations of this violence. More subtle but equally important forms of violence result from the highly inequitable distribution of wealth and opportunity. Many of these inequities have roots in historic racial and ethnic injustices and continue to manifest themselves, disproportionately, on populations of color.

We at FCNL believe that the federal government *must* address the systemic violence in U.S. society, even as we minister to people whose lives have been damaged by that violence. We believe that the government must act through laws and through the budget process to help create a society with justice

and equity for all and a community where every person's potential may be fulfilled.

Unfortunately, Pres. Bush's Faith-Based Initiative makes no mention of root causes of poverty, substance abuse, and social problems. Instead, the proposal implies that the solution to these problems rests with making more effective bandages. That is what the F-BI sets out to do by proposing to "devolve Federal support to state and local governments" and to "move support out to neighborhood-based caregivers."

Pres. Bush's proposal, in its failure even to mention root causes, effectively papers over the systemic violence in U.S. society. In so doing, it assures that the poverty and other societal problems that we face today will continue to be with us in the decades to come.

We at FCNL see an important role for faith-based organizations, beyond that of providing bandages. FCNL is a faith-based organization. We seek to work with Congress and the President to transform U.S. society by eliminating the systemic violence created by government policies. This approach will do more than help the poor to get by. It will ensure that fewer generations grow up in poverty and amidst the despair that breeds substance abuse, crime and myriad other problems.

The threat to the prophetic voice. In the Judeo-Christian tradition, one of the most important roles of the religious leader is to stand apart from the temporal power and speak in the prophetic voice. Thus, Moses declared to Pharaoh that the children of Israel should be released from bondage. Thus, Samuel announced to King Saul the Lord's rejection of Saul because of his disobedience. Thus, Nathan reproved King David for killing Uriah and taking Uriah's wife, Bathsheba. Thus, Elijah condemned King Ahab for promoting the worship of Baal. Thus, John the Baptist called the leadership of his national community a "brood of vipers" on account of their actions.



In more contemporary times, the prophetic voice has sometimes been exercised by the corporate community of faith, often at considerable cost to individual members. Throughout U.S. history, Friends have maintained a steadfast witness to the ungodliness of warfare. Friends' meetings and churches have supported their young male members in their refusal to be conscripted. The brunt of this witness has been borne by the young men themselves, many of whom suffered imprisonment or other punishment for their testimony.

In Nazi Germany, a branch of the Lutheran Church refused to acquiesce to the demand that it accept the supremacy of the state in matters of faith. Meeting in Barmen, these Lutherans confessed their faith in Jesus Christ as head of the Church. Many suffered and some died in concentration camps as a result.

In parts of Central America, where the economic disparity between impoverished peasants and wealthy landowners and rulers has grown to a virtual chasm, many local Roman Catholic priests have stood with the poor. Some, like Archbishop Romero, have given their lives.

In the U.S. today, many denominations have been among the faithful witnesses to the economic inequities and injustices in our society. We at FCNL believe that the faith community's prophetic voice is vital to the well-being of our society and the world. As the faith community ministers to the poor, the vulnerable, and the dispossessed of our nation and the world, the faith community does so both through its specific programs of ministry *and* through its prophetic voice.

Yet the prophetic voice can be stifled. Perhaps the most effective way of stilling the prophetic voice is to encourage the faith community to become dependent on the temporal powers. How better to do this than by offering churches, synagogues, and mosques money? Money quiets opposition in a way that persecution cannot.

In the world of scientific research, it is a well-established principle that researchers should be clear of financial conflicts of interest. A researcher who is a paid consultant for a pharmaceutical firm may not be in a position to criticize the performance of any drug made by that firm. If financial ties restrict objective analysis and criticism in the scientific realm, why should they be any less problematic in the social and political realm?



Conclusions

Quakers have, for hundreds of years, worked to secure religious freedom. Initially, Friends' efforts were stimulated by a desire to worship in a manner consistent with their beliefs, not in a manner prescribed by government. But Friends also sought to extend to persons of other faiths the same freedom of religion that Friends valued. Thus, the Quaker colony of Pennsylvania became a haven for persons of diverse faiths.

Today, although the Religious Society of Friends is a minority faith numerically, contemporary Quakers face few threats to our ability to freely exercise our religious beliefs. (The forced payment of war taxes is one notable exception.) Nonetheless, Quakers in the U.S. continue to support both the free exercise and the establishment clauses of the Constitution.

Friends understand the profound distress that others feel when their most deeply held beliefs are violated. Such violations are most often experienced by members of minority religious groups. They can be kept to a minimum when the constitutional separation of church and state is carefully observed.

When situations arise that threaten religious freedom, we at FCNL seek to give voice to our historic Quaker concern. Such is the situation now with Pres. Bush's Faith-Based Initiative which contains elements that would expand the use of public funds to support programs with pervasive religious content.

Moreover, we believe that the very way in which the President has framed the church-state issue is both inaccurate and non-constructive. The proposal ignores the long and productive relationship that has existed between many religious social service providers and the government in order to advance

the public funding of pervasively religious providers. This has the potential to exacerbate religious divisiveness in the United States' highly pluralistic environment.

Pres. Bush's failure to commit additional government funds to meeting vital human needs and the failure to address the root causes of those needs are major deficiencies in his proposal. The only source of new funds that the Faith Based Initiative identifies are the increases in private charitable giving that might be stimulated by changes in the tax code. While such giving may help bolster the social safety net, it is no substitute for a well-designed and adequately funded national program. Ignoring the systemic violence that underlies poverty and social distress ensures that the poor, indeed, will always be with us.

There are positive elements within the President's proposal. Some (though not all) of the mechanisms to stimulate charitable giving merit close consideration. We particularly note those proposals that would offer taxpayers in lower-income brackets the same type of tax benefits for charitable giving as are currently available to higher-income taxpayers. Establishing a White House Office and departmental Centers on Faith-Based and Community Initiatives can also be beneficial, provided that these offices are not directed to expand charitable choice.

Nonetheless, these potentially positive elements are, at present, dwarfed by the much more substantial problems inherent in the President's proposal. We at FCNL would encourage the President to reconsider and reconfigure his Faith-Based Initiative so as to nurture a more constructive relationship between government and religions.



FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON



NATIONAL LEGISLATION

*We seek a world free of war and the threat of war
We seek a society with equity and justice for all
We seek a community where every person's potential may be fulfilled
We seek an earth restored*

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ **Thank You** ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

This FCNL Perspectives paper, along with FCNL's many other educational resources, is made possible through the generous contributions of individuals and groups from around the country. Donations to FCNL [a 501(c)(4) organization] are not tax-deductible and go towards Quaker lobbying. Gifts to the FCNL Education Fund [a 501(c)(3) organization] are tax-deductible and support research and education.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ **You Can Add Your Support** ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Checks may be sent to FCNL at 245 Second Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002. Visa and MasterCard are accepted both by phone (800-630-1330) and online (www.fcnl.org, then click on the *Support FCNL Financially* button on the navigation bar).

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ **Use FCNL's Information and Resources** ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Web site: Visit us at <www.fcnl.org> for current information about important legislative issues, information on Congress, status of bills, tips on how to effectively engage your members of Congress, and much more.

Washington Newsletter: This monthly report provides news and analysis for a selection of domestic and international issues with a primary focus on peace, disarmament, international cooperation, and social and economic justice. It is sent free upon request and automatically to current donors.

Indian Report: This quarterly report on issues of importance to tribes and tribal advocates is also sent free upon request and automatically to current donors.

Listserv: Receive both weekly action alerts (Legislative Action Messages) and timely news and updates (INFOLINE). The Legislative Action Messages are also posted on our web site.

Action alerts on tribal issues: Periodic *Native American Legislative Updates* are sent via email and posted on FCNL's web site.



