FLORIDA COASTAL LAW JOURNAL · 2001

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Summary of Alternative Sentencing Theory

Spiritual Outputs Approach to Rehabilitation

Thomas F. Asbury

3 Fla. Coastal L.J. 41 (2001)

The American criminal justice system has systematically failed in its historical handling of defendants charged with drug and alcohol-related offenses. A staggering percentage of crimes are committed as a direct result of addiction; in many cases, but for the underlying substance abuse, these offenses would not have occurred. The traditional, archaic incarceration model is as shortsighted as it is counterproductive, operating on the logical fallacy that the mere passage of time behind bars can cure chemical dependency. Because prison environments often lack the transformative treatment necessary to overcome addiction, they fail both society and the convict, resulting in a cycle of recidivism and monumental economic costs.

To address this systemic collapse, I proposed the Spiritual Outputs Approach to Rehabilitation ("SOAR")—a novel constitutional framework designed to facilitate alternative sentencing through faith-based programs. Premised upon the critical need for holistic treatment and counseling, this theory applies a multi-dimensional test rooted in neutrality principles to prove how judges can constitutionally remand willing defendants to programs like Alcoholics Anonymous or Teen Challenge in lieu of prison. By addressing addiction as the root cause of criminal behavior, the SOAR framework significantly reduces recidivism and provides a quantifiable benefit to social welfare and the taxpayer.

Core Pillars of the SOAR Framework

The following table summarizes the key distinctions between the traditional model and the proposed alternative as detailed in the article:

Feature	Traditional Incarceration Model	Proposed SOAR Framework
Primary Philosophy	Retribution and Deterrence	Holistic Reformation
View of Addiction	Criminal Choice or "Disease"	Spiritual and Moral Sin
Treatment Strategy	Time-based Isolation	Crisis-based Spiritual Transformation
Constitutional Basis	Standard Sentencing Guidelines	Neutrality & Individual Choice
Societal Impact	High Recidivism & Economic Burden	Reduced Recidivism & Fiscal Savings

The Constitutional Path to Alternative Sentencing

The SOAR test provides a structured method for courts to evaluate faith-based sentencing without violating the Establishment Clause.

- **Sociological Neutrality:** The program must not promote one religion to the exclusion of others and must remain open to all regardless of religious affiliation.
- **Suspect Consent:** Involvement is strictly voluntary; the defendant must have an honest desire to commit to the program rather than serve time in jail.
- **Economic Rationality:** Courts consider the present and future societal implications of utilizing the program versus standard incarceration.
- **Outcome Focus:** Success is measured by long-term productivity and employment rather than merely avoiding re-arrest for one year.

Comparison of Rehabilitative Models

I examined three primary approaches to handling drug offenders:

- **Drug Treatment Courts ("DTC"):** These utilize therapeutic jurisprudence ("TJ") to provide court-supervised detoxification and counseling. While more humanistic than prison, the author argues that they're limited by strict eligibility rules and a "disease model" that may allow addicts to avoid personal responsibility.

- **Teen Challenge:** A Christian-based recovery program that views addiction as "sin" rather than a disease. This program is known for having statistically higher success rates in areas such as long-term employment and abstinence compared with secular, federally funded programs.
- **Alcoholics Anonymous ("AA"):** While AA includes a spiritual element, it is a 12-Step program that does not meet the criteria of a religion. Rather, it is a secular fellowship focused on helping alcoholics achieve health sobriety and does not include a doctrine of salvation.

The SOAR Test

The centerpiece of the article is the SOAR framework, a multi-dimensional test proposed to evaluate the constitutionality and efficacy of remanding defendants to faith-based programs. The test consists of three prongs:

1. **Sociological:** Incorporates neutrality principles to ensure the government does not promote one religion over others while analyzing the potential benefit and probability of success for society.
2. **Suspect-Oriented:** Requires the participant's explicit willingness to join the program and evaluates the "reason for offense" (*e.g.*, drug-motivated robbery vs. random violence).
3. **Economic:** Compares the societal costs and success probabilities of utilizing SOAR versus traditional incarceration or other secular alternatives.

Constitutional Analysis

My assertion is that remanding willing defendants to programs like Alcoholics Anonymous or Teen Challenge not only survives constitutional scrutiny and the *Lemon* Test but also serves a secular purpose (*e.g.*, rehabilitation and taxpayer savings), does not primarily advance religion (*i.e.*, as it is a voluntary choice between jail or treatment—and failure to complete the program results in a violation of one's probation and immediate incarceration), and avoids excessive government entanglement because programs like Alcoholics Anonymous and Teen Challenge are privately funded and operate independently.

The Vision Behind SOAR

My vision was to find a genuine solution to the societal problems created by a criminal justice system blindly devoted to retributive justice—one in which society at large seeks retribution and vengeance. Those norms did not merely punish; they systematically institutionalized generations of people, their families, and their communities. That is neither logical nor helpful.

For an addict who steals to acquire drugs, or an alcoholic who drives while intoxicated, incarceration offers only a temporary reprieve. Upon release—still untreated—the statistical probability that each will return to the very conduct that gave rise to the incarceration is all but guaranteed. Without treatment, jail does not solve the problem; it merely delays the inevitable.

In my experience, the best solutions tend to emerge from new and different perspectives—from questioning everything, and settled assumptions and societal norms most of all. This problem was no exception. A holistic approach—one focused on helping those charged with nonviolent drug- and alcohol-related offenses overcome the addiction that is the very reason for the crime—was the logical answer.

The theory is grounded in therapeutic jurisprudence and, to a significant degree, in the principles of restorative justice. Therapeutic jurisprudence treats the law itself as a therapeutic agent—an individualized, healing-oriented response to legal problems, expressed through mechanisms such as Drug Treatment Courts and faith-based programs like Teen Challenge that address the root causes of criminal behavior rather than its symptoms alone. Restorative justice supplies the complementary aim: to repair harm, rehabilitate the offender, and reintegrate him into the community, so that the benefit runs not only to the individual, but to his family, his community, and society at large.

That is the promise of SOAR—to give willing defendants a genuine second chance to achieve lasting sobriety and rebuild a life they can be proud of, and, in doing so, to break the cycle of addiction, poverty, and incarceration for the defendant, his family, and his community alike.