

**Robert A. Delfino**

St. John's University  
Staten Island, NY  
USA

**Andrew Gniadek**

Holy Apostles College and Seminary  
Cromwell, CT  
USA

## **THEOLOGY FOR NONES: HELPING PEOPLE FIND GOD IN A SECULAR AGE**

“Nones,” as opposed to Roman Catholic nuns, though the pronunciation is almost identical, is the term Pew Research uses to refer to the “religiously unaffiliated.” More precisely, the nones are people who “answer a survey question about their religion by saying that they have no religion, no particular religion, no religious preference, or the like.”<sup>1</sup> According to Pew Research, “Two-thirds of them say they believe in God (68%). More than half say they often feel a deep connection with nature and the earth (58%), while more than a third classify themselves as ‘spiritual’ but not ‘religious’ (37%).”<sup>2</sup> Finally, about 17% identify as agnostics and 13% identify as atheists.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “*Nones*” on the Rise: *One-in-Five Adults Have No Religious Affiliation* (Pew Research Center, 2012), 7, <http://www.pewforum.org/files/2012/10/NonesOnTheRise-full.pdf>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.

<sup>2</sup> “*Nones*” on the Rise, <http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> Michael Lipka, “A closer look at America’s rapidly growing religious ‘nones,’” <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/13/a-closer-look-at-americas-rapidly-growing-religious-nones/>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.

What percentage of people in the United States are nones? The answer is almost one in four, or 23%.<sup>4</sup> The nones have been growing over the years, and this is especially so among young people. About one-third of all adults under the age of 30 are nones.<sup>5</sup> In this essay, from a Roman Catholic perspective, we shall examine the rise of the nones, discuss various challenges for evangelization among the nones, and propose some ideas to address these challenges. Finally, we discuss some cultural concerns and problems that would probably result if the rise of the nones is left unaddressed.

### **The Rise of the Nones**

Let's begin with the big question—Why are we witnessing the rise of the nones? Why are many young people turning away from organized religion? Of course, this is a very complicated question and, obviously, we cannot give a comprehensive treatment of this question here. Indeed, there is a vast amount of literature on this topic, which can be found under different names. For example, Max Weber referred to it as “the disenchantment of the world,” but others refer to it as “secularization theory.”<sup>6</sup>

Putting terminology aside, many theories have been proposed for the West's increasing secularization. For example, in her book *How the West Really Lost God: A New Theory of Secularization*, Mary Eberstadt discusses some of the possible causes for the decline of religion that scholars have proposed, which include the following: (1) people no

---

<sup>4</sup> *America's Changing Religious Landscape: Christians decline sharply as share of population; unaffiliated and other faiths continue to grow* (Pew Research Center, 2015), 20, <http://www.pewforum.org/files/2015/05/RLS-08-26-full-report.pdf>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.

<sup>5</sup> “Nones” on the Rise, <http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/>.

<sup>6</sup> See Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958; originally published in 1905), and Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, “The Secularization Debate,” in *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3–32.

longer need the psychological comforts of religion; (2) the influence of modern science, rationalism, and the Enlightenment; (3) the World Wars; and (4) material progress.<sup>7</sup> In the end, she argues that the weakening of the traditional family is largely responsible.

There is certainly some truth to all of the above proposals. But rather than focusing on the causes of secularization, we want to try to understand the mindset of the nones. Here, we believe, the insights given by Charles Taylor in his almost 900-page magnum opus, *A Secular Age*, are very helpful. Taylor defines our secular age not as one in which religious belief is non-existent or withering away but one in which many people hold that an exclusive humanist alternative to Christian faith is a viable option. As he puts it, “a secular age is one in which the eclipse of all goals beyond human flourishing becomes conceivable.”<sup>8</sup> In other words, it is possible to conceive of the universe as disenchanted and without any need for God or any transcendent reality.

To live in this state of mind is to live in what Taylor calls the “immanent frame.” This frame of mind reflects life in the modern Western world, which is lived in a social order constructed by humans and is more individualistic and less communal than it was in the past, focuses on productivity and instrumental rationality, and values earthly goods and human flourishing.<sup>9</sup> As Taylor says, “the immanent frame is common to all of us in the modern West . . . Some of us want to live it as open to something beyond [e.g., to God]; some live it as closed. It is something which permits closure, without demanding it.”<sup>10</sup>

Life within the immanent frame, however, is not all roses. Some people feel malaise within it, finding it “empty” and, as Taylor puts it, they search “for something within, or beyond it, which could compen-

---

<sup>7</sup> Mary Eberstadt, *How the West Really Lost God: A New Theory of Secularization* (West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press, 2013), 59–88.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 19.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 542.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 543–544.

sate for the meaning lost with transcendence.”<sup>11</sup> This point, we believe, is very helpful to understanding the mindset of the nones. Some of the nones are content living in the immanent frame, while others search for something more either within or beyond it. As such, the nones can be roughly divided into two groups.

The first group is the *naturalists*. People in this group are neither spiritual nor religious and are comfortable living in the immanent frame. They rarely, if ever, feel the malaise Taylor mentions. The second group is the *spiritualists* because the people in this group are spiritual but not religious. Spiritualists can be further divided into two subgroups. For example, a good number of them believe in God or a higher power. Feeling the malaise of the immanent frame, they are searching for something beyond it, and for this reason we refer to them as the *transcendent spiritualists*. However, other spiritualists understand being spiritual in a non-transcendent way. They look for something within the immanent frame to address their spiritual needs, such as being devoted to a moral cause. For this reason we refer to this group as the *non-transcendent spiritualists*.

Of the three groups above, transcendent spiritualists are the closest to traditional religious believers, with the obvious exception that—rather than join or identify with an organized religion—they seek the transcendent on their own. However, to clarify the differences between the naturalists and the non-transcendent spiritualists, it will be helpful to consider some examples. With respect to the naturalists, many of the young, enthusiastic followers of the new atheists, such as Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris, qualify. They rarely, if ever, feel the malaise of the immanent frame and, generally speaking, spirituality of any kind is not important to them. Their passion lies in championing reason over faith and eliminating, as much as possible, the influence of religion in the world. Indeed, Sam Harris, in his book *The End of Faith: Religion, Terror, and the Future of Reason* said: “I hope to show that the very

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 302.

ideal of religious tolerance . . . is one of the principal forces driving us toward the abyss.”<sup>12</sup> Three months after publishing that book he wrote a short article titled “Science Must Destroy Religion.”<sup>13</sup>

However, some of the followers of the new atheists may be better classified as non-transcendent spiritualists. For example, this seems true of Sam Harris himself, who despite rejecting belief in God and the afterlife, argues for a non-transcendent kind of spirituality in his book *Waking Up: A Guide to Spirituality Without Religion*.<sup>14</sup> Another example of the non-transcendent spiritualists would be the post-Protestants, as discussed by Joseph Bottum in his book *An Anxious Age: The Post-Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of America*.<sup>15</sup> According to Bottum, the post-Protestants are heirs to the old mainline Protestants; however, the post-Protestants have lost their faith in traditional Christianity. He notes that, generally speaking, they are liberal in their politics, despise religion, and often describe themselves as spiritual but not religious. Their lineage can be traced back to Walter Rauschenbusch, the influential Baptist theologian and pastor of the early twentieth century.

Rauschenbusch worked in New York City, specifically in Hell’s Kitchen, and there witnessed deplorable social conditions, which affected him deeply. This in part helps explain why, as a theologian, he emphasized social sins and the need for action to combat them. He identified six social sins in his 1917 book *A Theology for the Social Gospel*: (1) bigotry, (2) power, (3) corruption of justice, (4) mob action, (5) militarism, and (6) class contempt.<sup>16</sup> According to Bottum, the post-

---

<sup>12</sup> Sam Harris, *The End of Faith: Religion, Terror, and the Future of Reason* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005), 15.

<sup>13</sup> Sam Harris, *Science Must Destroy Religion*, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sam-harris/science-must-destroy-reli\\_b\\_13153.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sam-harris/science-must-destroy-reli_b_13153.html), accessed on Oct 28, 2016.

<sup>14</sup> Sam Harris, *Waking Up: A Guide to Spirituality Without Religion* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2014).

<sup>15</sup> Joseph Bottum, *An Anxious Age: The Post-Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of America* (New York: Image, 2014).

<sup>16</sup> Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York: Macmillan, 1917), 240–279.

Protestants have largely adopted Rauschenbusch's social platform while stripping away any remnants of its Christianity. What is left is "a social gospel, without the gospel," as he puts it. Bottum explains:

In their view, the social forces of bigotry, power, corruption, mass opinion, militarism, and oppression are the constant themes of history. These horrors have a palpable, almost metaphysical presence in the world. And the post protestants believe the best way to know themselves as moral is to define themselves in opposition to such bigotry and oppression—understanding good and evil not primarily in terms of personal behavior but as states of mind about the social condition. Sin, in other words, appears as a social fact, and the redeemed personality becomes confident of its own salvation by being aware of that fact. By knowing about, and rejecting, the evil that darkens society.<sup>17</sup>

In short, for the post-Protestants, what was once Christianity has been thoroughly secularized. It now functions as a kind of civil religion, and in that way it helps them to focus on something within the immanent frame to address their spiritual needs.<sup>18</sup>

### **Helping the Nones Find God**

Having classified the nones, we can now address two related questions. First, how can we help the nones find God? Second, how can we get the nones to reconsider their views about organized religion? The first question will be our primary concern, and it should be addressed first because, generally speaking, it is *after* finding God (either through faith or other means) that one is more disposed to consider joining an organized religion.

---

<sup>17</sup> Bottum, *An Anxious Age*, 15.

<sup>18</sup> "The modern world, which denies personal guilt and admits only social crimes, which has no place for personal repentance but only public reforms, has divorced Christ from His Cross; the Bridegroom and Bride have been pulled apart." Fulton J. Sheen, *The Life of Christ* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958), 4.

With respect to finding God, naturalists and spiritualists pose different challenges. Nevertheless, we think a generic solution answers the difficulties of both groups. The first step is to get them to realize that the immanent frame is not enough. That is, they need to hear good arguments as to why it makes sense to hold that something transcending the immanent frame exists. This realization is the beginning of a journey that, hopefully, leads them to God. Even for those nones who say they believe in God or in a higher power, this first step includes clarifying one's conception of God and evaluating its merits.

Let's sketch how we see this playing out in the context of the spiritualists first. The spiritualists, as mentioned earlier, often feel the malaise of the immanent frame and are searching for something more either within it or beyond it. To the extent that they are searching and willing to talk with us, we think there are several avenues we can explore to help them address the question of God. We can focus, as applicable, on either the deep concerns of their hearts or their natural intellectual curiosity.

With respect to non-transcendent spiritualists interested in social justice and activism, we can raise philosophical questions about morality. If we can get the post-Protestants, for example, to understand that the human mind cannot be the ultimate foundation of the objective moral truths they hold dear, we can begin the discussion that helps them understand that a transcendent cause is necessary.<sup>19</sup> With respect to transcendent spiritualists who believe in some understanding of God but struggle to reconcile that understanding of God and modern science, for example, we can draw on the rich Catholic philosophical tradition of natural theology to demonstrate the dependence of modern science, not only on philosophy, but also on God.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Robert A. Delfino, "The Failure of New Atheism Morality," *Studia Gilsoniana* 4: 3 (2015): 229–240.

<sup>20</sup> For the dependency of modern science on philosophy, see Robert A. Delfino, "Red-path on the Nature of Philosophy," *Studia Gilsoniana* 5: 1 (2016): 33–53; and for a defense of the view that modern science is incompatible with atheism and requires

Whichever way we choose, the key is to approach those who are interested in a loving and non-pushy way. The spiritualists do not want what they perceive as the authoritarian/dogmatic side of religion—they want a more open discussion. In addition, some of them want a taste of the experiential and the mystical side of religion, if possible.

But this raises a new challenge, one of venue. Churches, for many obvious reasons, would not be a good venue for such discussions. Nones are already wary of organized religion, and at a church, where the primary directive is to minister to the faithful, they will get a taste of the authoritarian and dogmatic side of religion. Similarly, trying to find nones on the street and approaching them impromptu, as some Christians do, cannot help but come off as intrusive and pushy. But what other viable options are there?

We propose the creation of *Spiritual Journey Centers*, where people interested in exploring all things spiritual could go to and participate in various activities and discussions. Although we have our own take on how these Spiritual Centers should operate, we acknowledge that our inspiration for these centers comes from Jacques Maritain. In his book *Education at the Crossroads*, Maritain advocates:

The creation of centers of spiritual enlightenment, or schools of wisdom, in which those interested in the spiritual life would be able to lead a common life during some weeks, to be trained in the ways of spiritual life and contemplation, and to learn that science of evangelical perfection which is the highest part of theology. The immense treasure of the writings and doctrines of the great spiritual authors and the saints, which compose the mystical tradition of Christendom, from the Desert Fathers to St. John of the Cross and the mystics of modern times, would thus be made available to them . . . I conceive of these schools as houses of hospitality and enlightenment for human souls, which would be grounded on the integrity of a given religious faith and way of

---

monotheism, see Benedict M. Ashley and John Deely, *How Science Enriches Theology* (South Bend, Indiana: St. Augustine's Press, 2012), 15–28.

life, but which would be open not only to those sharing in this faith but also to all who desire to spend some days of spiritual refreshment there and to learn what they are ignorant of. People who assure the continuity of life and teaching in these schools of wisdom would stay there permanently. The others would be guests, meeting each other at regular periods.<sup>21</sup>

Like Maritain, we envision Catholic-run Spiritual Centers where people could participate in retreats, prayer meetings, group meditations, philosophical discussions, and so on. And we agree that having such centers with mentors and opportunities for spiritual experience is what this new generation needs to find God. They need a taste of authentic spiritual experience under the guidance of good teachers. And they need to see and experience the genuine happiness and joy of those living deeply spiritual lives. Such people can often inspire others and evangelize in a way that mere words cannot. In this, we are reminded of that quotation attributed to St. Francis of Assisi: “Preach the gospel, and if necessary, use words.”

However, we think Maritain’s conception of these centers is too narrow to address the concerns of the nones. As such, we conceive of our Spiritual Centers as more ecumenical and hosting a greater variety of activities than Maritain suggests. For example, we envision invited speakers from other religious traditions and other fields, such as science, to come and engage in dialogue about the deep spiritual questions of our age. We envision Catholic and other spiritual artists displaying and discussing their artworks. And, finally, we envision a very communal aspect to our Spiritual Centers where patrons are encouraged to invite their friends to attend events and explore these important topics in a welcoming and open environment.

Turning now to the naturalists, we face a much more difficult challenge. Many of them are hardcore atheists, and many of them think

---

<sup>21</sup> Jacques Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1943), 85–86.

that religion is evil. Some of them want to destroy religion, and therein lies the problem. As much as we might desire to leave them alone, some of them will not leave us alone. As others have noted, there is an “evangelical” nature to the new atheism, “which assumes that it has a Good News to share, at all cost, for the ultimate future of humanity by the conversion of as many people as possible.”<sup>22</sup> As such, whether we like it or not, we have to confront the naturalists. Unfortunately, we predict much less success with them as opposed to the spiritualists. Ironically, for all their talk of reason, the naturalists tend to have hardened hearts, which impairs their reason.<sup>23</sup> Still, we believe it is on the battleground of reason and science that the naturalists must be approached if any success is to be had at all.

One reason for this is that the naturalists try to use the modern experimental sciences as a weapon against the existence of God and against non-scientific ways of knowing. Indeed, it is common to find *scientism*, the view that only the modern experimental sciences give us knowledge, among the naturalists. One way to address this attack is to point out some serious problems with scientism.<sup>24</sup> First, belief in scientism turns out to be mere belief and not knowledge because there is no way to demonstrate that scientism is true via the experimental method of modern science. Second, and worse for the naturalists, belief in scientism turns out to be a false belief. This is because science presupposes other non-scientific forms of human knowledge such as sensation, memory, and linguistic knowledge—without which the activity of science is not possible. In addition, modern science also presupposes phil-

---

<sup>22</sup> Jeffrey W. Robbins and Christopher D. Rodkey, “Beating ‘God’ to Death: Radical Theology and the New Atheism,” in *Religion and the New Atheism: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Amarnath Amarasingam (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 35.

<sup>23</sup> James S. Spiegel, *The Making of an Atheist: How Immorality Leads to Unbelief* (Chicago, IL: Moody Publishers, 2010).

<sup>24</sup> Robert A. Delfino, “The Cultural Dangers of Scientism and Common Sense Solutions,” *Studia Gilsoniana 3: supplement* (2014): 485–496.

osophical knowledge such as logic and metaphysical notions such as truth and cause.

However, we think there is an even better argument to use against the naturalists—one which makes use of their very love for the modern sciences. The argument that we have in mind is the one made by Mariano Artigas in his book *The Mind of the Universe: Understanding Science & Religion*. Artigas lays out several necessary presuppositions of science, such that without them science is impossible.<sup>25</sup> Artigas notes that the greater the successes of science the greater justification there is for the truth of these necessary presuppositions. Thus as science continues to achieve more and more success it “retrojustifies” these necessary presuppositions. As Artigas says, “(1) I assert that there exists a feedback of scientific progress on its presuppositions as it *retrojustifies, enlarges, and eventually refines* them, and (2) I add that this feedback provides a most interesting basis for reflections in the philosophical and theological realms.”<sup>26</sup>

One important presupposition of science is that the universe is orderly and thus capable of scientific investigation. And over the last century physicists and cosmologists who study the universe have come to realize just how amazingly ordered the universe is. Indeed, many aspects of the universe are just as they must be in order for life to be possible.<sup>27</sup> Perhaps an argument can be made to some of the naturalists that the amazing order in the universe that is both necessary for and discovered by science requires an intelligence behind it.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, a

---

<sup>25</sup> Mariano Artigas, *The Mind of the Universe: Understanding Science and Religion* (Philadelphia and London: Templeton Foundation Press, 2000), 27–30.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>27</sup> Paul Davies, *Cosmic Jackpot: Why Our Universe Is Just Right for Life* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2007).

<sup>28</sup> Norris Clarke, “Is a Natural Theology Still Viable Today?,” in his *Explorations in Metaphysics: Being—God—Person* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 150–182. Using discoveries in modern physics and building off of the natural theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, specifically the fifth way, Clarke gives an argument

transcendent intelligence responsible for the order in the universe would address Albert Einstein's concern when he said "the eternal mystery of the world is its comprehensibility."<sup>29</sup>

In a similar vein, science would be impossible if nothing existed for science to study, which leads to the important philosophical question—why does anything exist at all?<sup>30</sup> Indeed, if the existence of the material world, which is the basis of the immanent frame, cannot be explained by appealing to the material world, then some transcendent cause is necessary.

### Our Future Culture

Finally, we want to briefly discuss some cultural concerns and problems that would probably result if the rise of the nones is left unaddressed. With respect to politics, it would not be good for Christians and other traditional religious groups if the nones become the majority. Already we are seeing a push by some in government to limit religious freedom.<sup>31</sup> And, culturally, it is becoming more difficult to live out a Christian life without being called a bigot by the secularists. Indeed,

---

that a transcendent intelligence is responsible for the order we find in the physical universe.

<sup>29</sup> Albert Einstein, *Out of My Later Years: The Scientist, Philosopher, and Man Portrayed Through His Own Words* (New York: Philosophical Library/Open Road, 2015), 64.

<sup>30</sup> John F. Wippel, ed., *The Ultimate Why Question: Why Is There Anything at All Rather than Nothing Whatsoever?*, Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy, vol. 54. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011).

<sup>31</sup> As just one example, consider that the United States Supreme Court declined to hear the case *Stormans Inc. v. Wiesman*, 579 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2016). This case involved a Washington State pharmacy, which was family-owned by devout Christians. These Christian Pharmacists did not want to carry emergency abortifacient contraceptives, but were being forced to do so by Washington State Law. Because the United States Supreme Court did not hear the case, the decision of the Ninth Circuit Court, which sided with Washington State, stands. In his dissent, Justice Alito discussed how this is an ominous sign for religious freedom ([https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/15pdf/15-862\\_2c8f.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/15pdf/15-862_2c8f.pdf), accessed on Oct 28, 2016).

this situation has inspired some, such as Rod Dreher, to call for Christians to drop out of mainstream culture and try to live their lives on a more local level. Dreher calls this the “Benedict Option.” According to Dreher, the Benedict option “is an umbrella term for Christians who accept [Alasdair] MacIntyre’s critique of modernity, and who also recognize that forming Christians who live out Christianity according to Great Tradition requires embedding within communities and institutions dedicated to that formation.”<sup>32</sup>

In contrast, we maintain hope that the tide can be turned. With the right approach, enough of the nones, especially the spiritualists, can find God and reaffirm the importance of religious freedom in our culture. However, the naturalists pose a significant danger. If the naturalists take over the culture, religious believers are in great trouble. Most likely, the great persecutions of the past would reappear. Here we are reminded of what the late Cardinal Francis George said could happen if we witness the complete secularization of our society: “I expect to die in bed, my successor will die in prison and his successor will die a martyr in the public square.”<sup>33</sup> It sounds fairly pessimistic until you hear the rest of what the late Cardinal said: “His successor will pick up the shards of a ruined society and slowly help rebuild civilization, as the church has done so often in human history.”

Let’s hope it does not come to that. Let’s hope, we never have to say, as Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn said of the disasters that had befallen Communist Russia: “Men have forgotten God; that’s why all this has

---

<sup>32</sup> Rod Dreher, *Benedict Option FAQ*, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/benedict-option-faq/>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016. We wish to note that at the time of the submission of this article, Dreher’s book, *The Benedict Option: A Strategy for Christians in a Post-Christian Nation*, had not yet been published.

<sup>33</sup> Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I., *The wrong side of history*, <http://www.catholicnewworld.com/cnwonline/2012/1021/cardinal.aspx>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016. See also Tim Drake, *Cardinal George: The Myth and Reality of ‘I’ll Die in My Bed’*, <http://www.ncregister.com/blog/tim-drake/the-myth-and-the-reality-of-ill-die-in-my-bed/#ixzz4Cvf1Ctc>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.

happened.”<sup>34</sup> Let’s hope, let’s pray, and let’s do what we can to help the nones find God.<sup>35</sup>

---

**THEOLOGY FOR NONES:  
HELPING PEOPLE FIND GOD IN A SECULAR AGE**

SUMMARY

One-third of all adults under the age of thirty in the United States of America are ‘nones’. Nones include atheists, agnostics, and those who answer “nothing in particular” to religious survey questions. In this article the authors examine the rise of the nones, drawing upon the work of Mary Eberstadt, Charles Taylor, and Joseph Bottum. We classify the nones into three groups: naturalists, transcendent spiritualists, and non-transcendent spiritualists. After discussing various challenges for evangelization among the nones, we propose some ideas to address these challenges. Here we draw upon the work of Saint Thomas Aquinas, Jacques Maritain, and Mariano Artigas. Finally, we discuss some cultural concerns and problems that would probably result if the rise of the nones is left unaddressed.

KEYWORDS

nones, atheists, agnostics, naturalists, spiritual but not religious, disenchantment, secularization theory, scientism, natural theology, spiritual centers, Sam Harris, Richard Dawkins, Walter Rauschenbusch, Mary Eberstadt, Charles Taylor, Joseph Bottum, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Jacques Maritain, Mariano Artigas.

REFERENCES

- Artigas, Mariano. *The Mind of the Universe: Understanding Science and Religion*. Philadelphia and London: Templeton Foundation Press, 2000.
- Ashley, Benedict M. and John Deely. *How Science Enriches Theology*. South Bend, Indiana: St. Augustine’s Press, 2012.
- Bottum, Joseph. *An Anxious Age: The Post-Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of America*. New York: Image, 2014.
- Clarke, Norris. *Explorations in Metaphysics: Being—God—Person*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Davies, Paul. *Cosmic Jackpot: Why Our Universe Is Just Right for Life*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2007.

---

<sup>34</sup> Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, “Men Have Forgotten God: The Templeton Address,” in *In the World: Reading and Writing as a Christian*, ed. John H. Timmerman and Donald R. Hettinga (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), 145.

<sup>35</sup> Robert and Andrew would like to thank Heather M. Erb and Peter A. Redpath for their help and encouragement. *Et Deo Gratias*.

- Delfino, Robert A. "Redpath on the Nature of Philosophy." *Studia Gilsoniana* 5: 1 (2016): 33–53.
- Delfino Robert A. "The Cultural Dangers of Scientism and Common Sense Solutions." *Studia Gilsoniana* 3: supplement (2014): 485–496.
- Delfino, Robert A. "The Failure of New Atheism Morality." *Studia Gilsoniana* 4: 3 (2015): 229–240.
- Eberstadt, Mary. *How the West Really Lost God: A New Theory of Secularization*. West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press, 2013.
- Einstein, Albert. *Out of My Later Years: The Scientist, Philosopher, and Man Portrayed Through His Own Words*. New York: Philosophical Library/Open Road, 2015.
- Harris, Sam. *Waking Up: A Guide to Spirituality Without Religion*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2014.
- Harris, Sam. *The End of Faith: Religion, Terror, and the Future of Reason*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2005.
- Maritain, Jacques. *Education at the Crossroads*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1943.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter. *A Theology for the Social Gospel*. New York: Macmillan, 1917.
- Robbins, Jeffrey W. and Christopher D. Rodkey. "Beating 'God' to Death: Radical Theology and the New Atheism," in *Religion and the New Atheism: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Amarnath Amarasingam. Leiden: Brill, 2010, 25–36.
- Sheen, Fulton J. *The Life of Christ*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr. "Men Have Forgotten God: The Templeton Address," in *In the World: Reading and Writing as a Christian*, ed. John H. Timmerman and Donald R. Hettinga. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 145–152.
- Spiegel, James S. *The Making of an Atheist: How Immorality Leads to Unbelief*. Chicago, IL: Moody Publishers, 2010.
- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958; originally published in 1905.
- Wippel, John F., ed. *The Ultimate Why Question: Why Is There Anything at All Rather than Nothing Whatsoever?*, Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy, vol. 54. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011.

#### The Internet Sources

*America's Changing Religious Landscape: Christians decline sharply as share of population; unaffiliated and other faiths continue to grow*. Pew Research Center, 2015. <http://www.pewforum.org/files/2015/05/RLS-08-26-full-report.pdf>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.

- Drake, Tim. *Cardinal George: The Myth and Reality of 'I'll Die in My Bed'*. <http://www.ncregister.com/blog/tim-drake/the-myth-and-the-reality-of-ill-die-in-my-bed/#ixz z4CvflCItc>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.
- Dreher, Rod. *Benedict Option FAQ*. <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/benedict-option-faq/>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.
- George, Francis Cardinal, O.M.I. *The wrong side of history*. <http://www.catholicnewworld.com/cnwonline/2012/1021/cardinal.aspx>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.
- Harris, Sam. *Science Must Destroy Religion*. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sam-harris/science-must-destroy-reli\\_b\\_13153.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sam-harris/science-must-destroy-reli_b_13153.html), accessed on Oct 28, 2016.
- Lipka, Michael. "A closer look at America's rapidly growing religious 'nones'." <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/13/a-closer-look-at-americas-rapidly-growing-religious-nones/>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.
- "*Nones*" on the Rise: *One-in-Five Adults Have No Religious Affiliation*. Pew Research Center, 2012. <http://www.pewforum.org/files/2012/10/NonesOnTheRisefull.pdf>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.
- "*Nones*" on the Rise. <http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/>, accessed on Oct 28, 2016.
- The United States Supreme Court. The case *Stormans Inc. v. Wiesman*, 579 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2016). [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/15pdf/15-862\\_2c8f.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/15pdf/15-862_2c8f.pdf), accessed on Oct 28, 2016.