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Abstract
It is argued that the standard view of politics and religion is based on well-established moral and political arguments. Faithfully, I (hereafter: the writer) would argue that there is another argument that could prove that not only the standard view is true, but also, theocracy as a political view that refuses the standard view is certainly false. It is called as Covid-19 Sample Argument.

The Standard View and Theocratic Anti-Model
Normatively, the main relation between religion and Political Philosophy has been called standard view (hereafter: SV), it is SV because some strong liberal arguments have produced a consensus or convergent on the relation. Philosophers have called this position toward SV as secularism, also SV produces The Doctrine of
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Religious Restraint (hereafter: DRR) that is an asymmetry secular restraint on religious roles in public spheres, those roles that do not have a rationale for secular coercive laws. Although, theocracy, as a political view, has a different story. theocracy is not finding a place of religion in politics and it is not a model on the relation between politics and religion, even though, it is an anti-model of the relation, it is on the authority of religion to the government.

**Covid-19 Sample Argument**
Straightforwardly, the writer will present an argument that shows SV is true and so, only public reasons those could epistemologically and ethically enroll their public justification deserve to fill public spheres. The argument will prove legitimate non-theocratic authority and government and it is also in disfavor of theocratic political authority and government. The writer will borrow some symbols and present the argument that is come from the covid-19 pandemic. It is *Covid-19 Sample Argument*:

X = someone is religious and infected by Covid-19 disease,
OM = otherworldly medical method,
TM = thisworldly medical method,

The writer's footnote: Very recently, I have found that D. Z. Phillips presented an example "Prayer-Medicine" and Bertrand Russell wrote a chapter "Demonology and Medicine" that would be similar to "Covid-19 Sample Argument". However, first of all, they are in the Philosophy of Religion and the Philosophy of Science, and they are not in the Social and Political Philosophy. Next, the examples are only simple comparisons and without philosophical details, also they are not developed arguments. Besides that, the examples need to be examined empirically as Phillips and Russell mentioned, though, the argument of the writer's work is a normative and philosophical one.
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OTM = otherworldly thisworldly medical method like some medicines that have thisworldly material but it is claimed that they have come from otherworldly prescriptions.

Y = is X who has been cured by OM / TM.

1. ∃X, X OB becomes Y 
2. X PE treat with OM 
3. ◇, X becomes Y and so, ∃Y 
4. X PE treat with TM 
5. ◇, X becomes Y and so, ∃Y 
6. ◇, ¬∃Y 
7. ◇, ¬∃Y 

N = is X but only believe to treat with OM.

8. ∃N, X OB becomes N 
9. N OB treat with OM (for example, praying, miracle and ...) & N IM treat with TM 
10. ◇, N becomes Y and so, ∃Y 
11. ¬∃Y 
12. If N treats with TM, but, □, N does not treat with TM 
13. ▼ 

K = is X but believe to treat with OM, TM, OTM.

14. ∃K, X OB becomes K 
15. K PE treat with OM & OTM & TM (based on consistency among them) 
16. ◇, K PE treat with OT, ∃K 
17. ◇, K PE treat with OTM, ∃K 
18. ◇, K PE treat with TH, ∃K 
19. ◇, if OTM does not ∈ OM (for example, historically some may ask whether OTM belongs to otherworldly entities?), then what K will do? to (18) 
20. ◇, if OTM ∨ TM or OM ∨ TM (Because, 1. there is a new TH that is better than OTM, or there is a new TM that replaces OTM, 2. Or there is a contrast between OTM and TM), then what K will do? (14) to (18) 
21. 13 ∨ ¬15 (that means it is self-defeating like the death of X or X will face non-consistency).

If the argument is plausible, then it is true that every theocracy is false and it does not matter whether one has applied this or that religion. As soon as you fill public institutions with religion, you will face the covid-19 sample. Here are some mainstreams of it:

L1= is a government that would apply the Y method,

22. ∃L1, X OB becomes L1 institutionally 
23. □, L1 could not employ Y institutionally 
24. Because, □, there could be ¬∃Y 

L2= is a government that would apply the N method,
25. \( \exists L_2, X \text{ OB becomes } L_2 \text{ institutionally} \)
26. \( \Box, L_2 \text{ could not employ } N \text{ institutionally} \) (13)(25)
27. Because, \( \Box, L \text{ will face } \perp \) (26)

\( L_3 = \) is a government that would apply the K method,

28. \( \exists L_3, X \text{ OB becomes } L_3 \text{ institutionally} \)
29. \( \Box, L_2 \text{ could not employ } N \text{ institutionally} \) (21)(28)
30. Because, \( \Box, L \text{ will face } 13\lor15 \) (29)

The writer is sure that \( L_1, L_2, \) and \( L_3 \) are the blocking future of every single theocratic government that struggles with a crisis or other debates of governing like the Covid-19 sample. However, there could be some potential objections against the argument:

The Referendum Objection: First possible objection would be that one may argue that it is possible for a state organizes a referendum on the Covid-19 sample to know whether citizens of a country would like to be \( Y, N, K \) and expand this decision to the public sphere, legally, governmental, and socially.

- However, one has to remember that you will face Covid-19 die off the humankind if you hold the referendum.

- Another reply would be that if they want to insist on OM or OTM, it may die off humankind, then they have to remain a staunch advocate of OM or OTM and do not switch to TM. But, we know they ought to do that.

The Irrelevancy of Social Sciences Objection: Second of all, one may argue that there is a strict distinction between, on the one side, there are applied sciences, for example, Medicine, Engineering, and natural sciences viz Physics or Biology, and on the other side, there are social sciences, for example, sociology or political sciences and humanities viz philosophy. The writer’s reply has four-dimensional:

- First of all, it is a straw man fallacy, since one seems to forget that the writer has chosen the Covid-19 sample as a sample of the public institutions’ epistemic content. You could replace the argument with another one that may come from Engineering. For instance, imagine one needs to call firefighters with a cellphone to rescue herself from a firestorm, but, there is a religion that confines yourself to calling by a cellphone, or imagines you have to do that to rescue an official public organization and its employees from the firestorm. In this case, vis-a-vis, you have to follow the argument.

- In addition, the writer is extremely doubtful that one could draw those boundaries among sciences, day to day, more and more, there are multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary subjects and aspects among the sciences. Also, on the same page, there are some perspectives in which they have put together social sciences over natural sciences.

- The next is that norms and values that have been found out and/or constructed by philosophy and its branches such as ethics, social and political philosophy, and philosophy of law are non-replaceable. These epistemic
dimensions of these branches of philosophy are categorized as value theory and they are unique among all majors and subjects, enforce one to come up with idea that she could not prevent these aspects of human knowledge and philosophy is the most fundamental segment of the knowledge.

- Another reply would be a thought experiment: imagine a world in which a terrific accident by an employee’s nuclear energy company has precipitated a temporary power outage in the whole world. In this case, the human being has to live in this painful situation for more than four decades. It is clear that too many struggles may blow up by this accident. One of them is an opportunist queen of a country who commands her chemists to produce a kind of food that belongs to a religious diet that will addict all indigenous children of some territories. The queen would diminish indigenous cultures, languages, and religions and replace them with the queen's country by addicting and killing innocent indigenous children. Disgracefully she would transfer all of the human beings' civilization to the queen's country. Moreover, there is a theocratic government in one of those territories that ludicrously insists on this significant religious diet. There is no electricity for medical doctors to collect information on the addiction and they could not know to treat the children, this ignorance causes the death of children. Fortunately, there are some social scientists who could gather data on the addiction in that society and caution the theocratic government. Social scientists reach a consensus on this consensus has been achieved through positive addiction and death by 9999 cases from 10000 cases, and so, theocracy shall proscribe this diet. Everyone knows that there is no medical treatment and medicine and the only method to know about the diet is the outcome of social scientists' research. One more, vis-a-vis, you have to follow the argument.

The Form Objection: Another objection would be that one may argue that a theocracy could avoid filling the contents of public institutions epistemologically and ethically, but let its form of it remain theocratically the religious one.

- The writer would caution if the one imposes the secular or epistemic-ethical law and politics instead of religious law and politics into provisions and constitutions in a theocracy, the one will face the theocratic paradox that means theocracy in which set religious authority and track the non-religious authority in its law and politics.

- Another case would be that the one may less rationally call it that it is not a paradox, but it is only that there would arise a meaningless theocracy that recognizes itself as a theocracy but runs non-theocratic laws and politics.

The Scarce Fundamentalists Objection: Here is a common objection, one could present an objection that philosophers caution governments to not apply theocracy as a political view. It is because theocracy attacks the most fundamental values, and so, the writer need not anchor non-moral norms i.e. Covid-19 sample as the argument presents.

- Although, the writer would insist a note that the one has to stand this condition that there could be a theocracy and/or fundamentalists that basically may reject the fundamental moral norms against it, and this fact
leads the writer to discover what would be another defeater of theocracy and the writer founds out that it is the covid-19 sample.

The Last Version Objection: Another objection that has been common among religious scholars is that let is patient with the new scientific and philosophic discoveries. In other words, our version of religion would be regarding the last findings of sciences and philosophies. As a result, it seems that there is no non-consistency and/or self-defeating between them to be an obstacle to a theocracy. So, the theory of everything or the most developed version of knowledge i.e. sciences and philosophy could lead to being recognized as a whole or part of a religion and this could transfer to a government as a theocracy.

- The First reply would be that it is the real hypocrisy of those scholars and theocracies. This real hypocrisy is seriously immoral and harmful to both public institutions and the morality of ordinary people.

- Second of all, the question would arise that whether those religions include nothingness and so, why do we have to keep them as segments of a government as much as those religions include nothingness and this enforces a government to be meaningless and nonfunctional.

The Religious Democratic Twin Objection: Some proponents of theocracy and others would recognize theocracy and religious democracy interchangeably. Therefore, it may conceal the serious and main weaknesses of theocracy. But, the writer believes that there could not be sophisticated examples of this interchangeability.

- First and foremost, it is the very common reply that the mainstream of democracy is that political authority has to place thisworldly, democracy's political authority is not otherworldly and religious. As a result, it is not only true that theocracy is not religious democracy, but also, it is not a solution to change theocracy with theodemocracy, since, it remains political authority as an otherworldly and religious one.

- Another cautionary note is that the first reply of this object indicates that this differentiation is on political authority, thus, other related topics of the differentiation arise after political authority i.e. freedom of religion or religious rights.

The Functional Illegitimate Objection: Functionally appropriateness of totalitarian regimes’ special attributes inclines theocracy's proponents to dwell on the idea that if theocracy could provide some of those attributes, then the opponents have to confirm that theocracy is satisfying.

- The writer enormously disagrees that the theocratic government could provide those functions. It is because of the argument.

- Besides that, not only due to the above-mentioned normative reply but also, there could not be a similarity between other totalitarian regimes and theocratic governments. It is due to the fact that the authority of the former is
placed in a thisworldly manner, but the latter recognizes and puts the authority in an otherworldly manner, this reinforces the idea that theocratic governments could not appear as functional appropriateness.

**Conclusion**

This argument has proved that public spheres and institutions such as society or law or government have to fill only with knowledge. Besides that, it is clear that theocracies have been filling their public institutions with OTM or OM that will struggle with self-defeating and/or non-consistency. It was the writer's innovative argument that would persist that SV is true and theocracy is false.
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