**CHANGE NOTE 1563 blue words**

Please use this form to address the reviewers’ comments. We understand that occasionally the reviewers’ comments and scores might conflict with each other. You will need to address all comments made by each reviewer. If substantial revisions are not made, you will be asked to make further changes before your article is moved into the next stage of the publication process. Send the completed change note with your submission.

**Reviewer One**

* SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS: Please copy and paste the comments or suggestions left by Reviewer One.

1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding

* The topic needs addressing, because it deals with the question of the cohesion  
  between spirituality in secular societies and its well-being. This is important in the sense that many modern people turn their back to religion, but still have the spiritual problems leading them to psychological problems and burn-outs.
* The investigated area is interesting – the author 1. tries to determine the spiritual tradition of secularism, 2. proposes the spiritual perspectives of work and leisure
* There are some points in the text needed more data or textual analyses. For example: 1. The author makes “the historical discussion of spiritual voidness in secularism from Kierkegaard in the mid-nineteenth century to Dreyfus and Kelly”. But there were only Kierkegaard and Dreyfus and Kelly. 2. After Kierkegaard (mid-19th century) the author immediately comes to theory of Dreyfus and Kelly. However, are there no secularism analysis between Kierkegaard and Dreyfus and Kelly? 3.There were the phrase about “a much higher rate of deaths of despair among the white working class without college degrees”. However, is there a full confidence that the lack of spirituality was a cause for these deaths?

1. Conceptual Model

* The main categories the author uses are “spirituality”, “work”, “leisure” and  
  “contemplation”. In the context of the investigation, these categories are  
  appropriate. However, there are some critical points.
* In the paper there was no clear definition for “leisure 2”. First –the distinctions between “leisure 1” and “leisure 2” are unclear. The author argues that leisure 1 allows to have fun and to forget about the reality, while “in leisure 2 a person continues to observe various aspects of reality”. Is it possible for leisure 2 to function as enjoyment (when a person, for example, reads a philosophical literature) and for leisure 1 to have its spiritual side (for example, during the touristic excursion)? There should be an explanation, why not. Second – are leisure 2 and contemplation the practices for spirituality? Is leisure 2 and spirituality the same thing? There should be the clearer explanation about correlation of these three categories.
* Author highlights that contemplation is a very important part of leisure 2. According the author, contemplation could be practiced through “playing music, singing, painting, or writing a journal”. Could these activities be the parts of work or leisure 1, or not? The boundaries between leisure 1 and leisure 2 are unclear.
* The definition “secular society” is also needed explanation. What the author understands under it? Is secular society same in the different parts of the modern world (West and Ost Europe, Asia, Africa etc.)?

1. Explanatory Logic

* The author’s goal is “to characterize the spiritual voidness of secularism and  
  recharacterize the sources of the problem”. According the text, the main points that led the secular society to “the spiritual voidness” are the permanent balance between changing the reality (work) and forgetting the reality (leisure 1). To fill this voidness, the author discusses the advantages of leisure 2. However, the text has some problems with the explanatory structure.
* The paper’s restructuration in some parts recommended. The same theses are  
  repeated, which makes following the author’s thoughts difficult. For example, in “Recharacterizing the Problem” author writes about the problems for leisure 2 in modern world. And then in “Contemplation as the Main Practice of Leisure 2” almost the same discussion about leisure 2 begins as if anew.
* It would be desirable, if the author explain in more details in which points her/his own approach differs from the approaches of Arendt’s and Dreyfus and Kelly’s.
* Some problems that author describes as a part of spiritual sphere seem to be from the economic sphere. For example - in the way the author describes the leisure 2 (neglected because of the work and leisure 1) – it seems that the problem has more economic than educational sense, because working people often have no time for leisure 2.

1. Implications and Applications

* The paper makes an original contribution to knowledge in the sense of the  
  spirituality’s role in the secular society’s life. We find author’s position toward  
  spirituality in secular society perspective, because it breaks the casual point of view that secular is almost a synonym for atheistic.
* The spiritual approach to the secular society’s life allows new intellectual ground, because it means a new point of view for the problem of social attitude to reality and to its changing.
* The author’s proposal about inconclusion of spirituality through leisure 2 into the system of the life modes sounds interesting, but 1. there is no concrete explanation why a human cannot reach spirituality, for example, through work, 2. there was no clear definition what leisure 2 is.

1. Quality of Communication

* In the paper’s title we read “Secularism and the Right to Spirituality: Work, Leisure, and Contemplation”. However, “the right” sounds unclear, because the question arises: does the secular society take away this right? If yes, in which sense? Was the process of taking away long or did it happen suddenly?
* In general terms, the article clearly expresses its case, measured against the  
  standards of the technical language of its field and the reading capacities of audiences academic, tertiary student, and professional. There were no serious problems with understanding author’s point. The problem is – often the author repeats the same in different parts of the text (see comments in *3.Explanatory Logic*)
* We made some comments in the text (yellow color)
* REVISIONS MADE: Changes made as a consequence of SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS or numerical scores.

1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding

* There are some points in the text needed more data or textual analyses. For example: 1. The author makes “the historical discussion of spiritual voidness in secularism from Kierkegaard in the mid-nineteenth century to Dreyfus and Kelly”. But there were only Kierkegaard and Dreyfus and Kelly. 2. After Kierkegaard (mid-19th century) the author immediately comes to theory of Dreyfus and Kelly. However, are there no secularism analysis between Kierkegaard and Dreyfus and Kelly? **Revisions made**: It was not my intention to survey the critics of modern secularism from Kierkegaard to Dreyfus and Kelly; rather, I meant only to present two different thinkers, from different eras, upon which I can base a description regarding characteristics of the spiritual voidness of secularism. Therefore I have refined my formulation in the following way to better express my intent: [to paste citation of the first paragraph section: The Spiritual Void….]
* .

1. Conceptual Model

* In the paper there was no clear definition for “leisure 2”. First –the distinctions between “leisure 1” and “leisure 2” are unclear. The author argues that leisure 1 allows to have fun and to forget about the reality, while “in leisure 2 a person continues to observe various aspects of reality”. Is it possible for leisure 2 to function as enjoyment (when a person, for example, reads a philosophical literature) and for leisure 1 to have its spiritual side (for example, during the touristic excursion)? There should be an explanation, why not. Second – are leisure 2 and contemplation the practices for spirituality? Is leisure 2 and spirituality the same thing? There should be the clearer explanation about correlation of these three categories. **Revisions made**: The section "Contemplation as the Main Practice of *Leisure 2*" is dedicated to the characterization of what I mean by *leisure 2*. I characterize this mental mode at length, in its affinity to the two other mental modes of *work* and *leisure 1*. I make it clear in the section that while in *leisure 1* mental mode, a person doesn't pursue reality as it is, but rather pursues her or his distraction from reality, whereas in leisure 2 one is driven by a wish to observe, to contemplate reality as a whole, accepting it as it is. The first paragraph of the section defines the concept, and the rest of the section elaborates some aspects of contemplation and *leisure 2* in detail. The last paragraph of the section summarizes these characterizations. Nevertheless, reviewer 1 is right in asking for a bottom-line assertion regarding *leisure 2*. Therefore I have added the following clarifying sentences to the section’s summarizing paragraph: [On the contrary to *leisure 1*, distraction, resting, or enjoyment are not the aim or motivation of *leisure 2*. A person does not enter *leisure 2* and contemplative mode for enjoyment. Rather, it is being done as a spiritual-moral obligation. For example, a typical case for leisure 2, coming from the Jewish world of Torah, are the ideas and practices of Talmud Torah (Torah studying for its own sake), and of observing the Shabbat. Whether one likes it or not, whether it brings joy or not, one sees oneself as obliged to practice these spiritual exercises. And so, the idea of *leisure 2* is a generalization of times devoted to such practices. It is a time devoted to contemplate reality as a whole in a positive affinity, i.e. without a wish it would be different then it is, and, without expectation to any results or outcomes from that state, in terms of health or what the person feels or wish to feel. To paste the last paragraph of the section: contemplation….]
* Author highlights that contemplation is a very important part of leisure 2. According the author, contemplation could be practiced through “playing music, singing, painting, or writing a journal”. Could these activities be the parts of work or leisure 1, or not? The boundaries between leisure 1 and leisure 2 are unclear. **Revisions made:** In order to prevent confusion at the indicated point, I added the following clarification on page 8: [Yet, it should be emphasized that even though these activities seem to be a general leisure activities, they may create *leisure 2* only if one practicing them as a tool of contemplating reality as it is, as a whole, and without using them as an instrument to achieving rest, enjoyment, distraction from reality and so on. Otherwise they would consider to be *work* or *leisure 1*.]
* …]

1. Explanatory Logic
2. Implications and Applications

* The author’s proposal about inconclusion of spirituality through leisure 2 into the system of the life modes sounds interesting, but 1. there is no concrete explanation why a human cannot reach spirituality, for example, through work, 2. there was no clear definition what leisure 2 is. **Revision made:** I added five sentences to further clarify the meaning of *leisure 2*. I believe that it is clearer now. Specifically, the mental mode of *work* is one in which we approach reality through a motivation to change it; by contrast, in the contemplative spiritual mode that creates *leisure 2*, we are approaching reality as a whole, without any wish that it should be different or other than it is. [See again the lines added on page 9, at the end of the section "Contemplation as the Main Practice of *Leisure 2*"]

1. Quality of Communication

* **REVISIONS NOT MADE:** If SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS are not incorporated into your revision, please list and explain with reasons for rejection.

1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding

* 3.There were the phrase about “a much higher rate of deaths of despair among the white working class without college degrees”. However, is there a full confidence that the lack of spirituality was a cause for these deaths? **Response and explanation:** Regarding reviewer 1's doubts about the reasons for death of despair, I decided not to revise, since the sentence (pp.3-4) only suggests a *possible* connection between the spiritual void in secularism and the phenomenon of death of despair among the white working class without college degrees—college study being, as I show in the last sections, a platform for spiritual development and education. I think this social fact should be noted, and that the possibility of connection is not groundless.

1. Conceptual Model

* The definition “secular society” is also needed explanation. What the author understands under it? Is secular society same in the different parts of the modern world (West and Ost Europe, Asia, Africa etc.)? **Response and explanation:** I decided not to revise since the whole article deals with the question of what secularism is. The starting point is the common characterization of Zuckerman and Shook 2017. Then I add other characterizations, but only to argue something else later on. For example, on page 7 I write: "secularism, as it took shape in our culture, not only legitimated humanity to change reality in accordance with human desires; it commanded humanity to do so. In addition, the idea of individualism led to the legitimation of *leisure 1*, which was further entrenched by its significant contribution to the commercial market and capital growth", only to argue later that this actual shape of secularism is not necessary, as indeed it can see itself as spiritual culture with its own contemplative practices. In other words, on the one hand I describe the actual common approach of secularism to itself: a perspective that denies the responsibility of society for the spiritual life of its members, yet does not intrinsically exclude spirituality altogether from the realm of secularism, which approach results in spiritual crisis. On the other hand, the article describes, in terms of spirituality, how secularism should understand itself. This change in self-perspective may, as I suggest, bring relief from this spiritual crisis. The article doesn’t deal with specific secular societies, but rather examines the intersection of secularism and spirituality, in order to suggest a new perspective on secularism that may remove its spiritual voidness in the public sphere. [to consider bringing more citation from the article]

1. Explanatory Logic

* The same theses are repeated, which makes following the author’s thoughts difficult. For example, in “Recharacterizing the Problem” author writes about the problems for leisure 2 in modern world. And then in “Contemplation as the Main Practice of Leisure 2” almost the same discussion about leisure 2 begins as if anew. **Explanation for non-revision:** I decided not to revise because there are profound differences between the two sections reviewer 1 mentions. In the sub-section "Characterizing the Problem" I suggest, after analyzing the notions of *work* and *leisure 1*, a new understanding (relative to Arendt and Dreyfus and Kelly) of the sources of the spiritual crisis in secular societies. I describe the cultural dynamic of the dominance of the mental modes of *work* and *leisure 1*, and the seesaw between them. By contrast, in the next section, “Contemplation as the Main Practice of *Leisure 2*"*,* I describe in detail a third mental mode – that of contemplation, the one that, as I suggested in the preceding section, is missing from the secular public sphere.
* It would be desirable, if the author explain in more details in which points her/his own approach differs from the approaches of Arendt’s and Dreyfus and Kelly’s. **Explanation for non-revision:**  I decided not to revise. In the subsection "Recharacterizing the problem" (p.7) I write: "Whereas Arendt (1998) seeks the root of the problem of the (secular) human condition in the relations between the three modes of the *vita activa* – action, work and labor *–* and in the domination of labor over the two others, I attribute the problem to the marginalization and silencing of contemplation and *leisure 2* by the dominant modes of *work* and *leisure 1*. In order to enhance the place of spirituality in public secular life, this third mode, encompassing contemplation and *leisure 2*,must be included." Also, on page 5 I describe Arendt’s analysis of the term “work,” and then I suggest, in affinity to that background, my own definition of it. I believe that the differences are clear. Regarding Dreyfus and Kelly's conceptions, I decided not to revise since in the subsection "Dreyfus and Kelly on Overcoming Spiritual Voidness," I present their suggestion and criticize it by using Taylor (2011b). I write on page 4: "Taylor (2011b) is correct in his criticism of Dreyfus and Kelly's diagnosis and reflective polytheistic vision." Then I go on to add another critical argument of my own, writing: "Yet there is another problem in Dreyfus and Kelly’s account that Taylor does not confront. Although Dreyfus and Kelly stress the need for a sovereign meta-perspective, the “*meta-poietic* skill” (Dreyfus and Kelly 2011, 220), they fail to give an explicit account of *how* reflection of this kind can emerge and develop if we are so tightly emotionally connected to the world. In addition, they fail to explain on what grounds this mental faculty works, from whence it draws its perspective and criteria. This absence of an explanation directs the reader to the classic faculty of reason. But reason, whether in the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle, or Kant, is an unworldly faculty. Therefore, Dreyfus and Kelly’s concept of meta-poietic skill is at odds with their intentions to reconnect the modern secular subject to the world." After that I go on to the next section, in which I describe my own, quite different account regarding the cause of the spiritual crisis.
* Some problems that author describes as a part of spiritual sphere seem to be from the economic sphere. For example - in the way the author describes the leisure 2 (neglected because of the work and leisure 1) – it seems that the problem has more economic than educational sense, because working people often have no time for leisure 2. **Explanation for non-revision:** I decided not to revise. To be sure, reviewer 1 is partially right. But what I claim is exactly this, that what seems to be an endless need to work, which appears as if it were an economic problem, is actually none other than a cultural deviation and an unbalanced way of life. It is a mode of life that forgets, at least in the public sphere, to activate spirituality, and more particularly contemplation and the creation of leisure 2. In short, it is only *apparently* an economic problem.

1. Implications and Applications
2. Quality of Communication

* In the paper’s title we read “Secularism and the Right to Spirituality: Work, Leisure, and Contemplation”. However, “the right” sounds unclear, because the question arises: does the secular society take away this right? If yes, in which sense? Was the process of taking away long or did it happen suddenly? **Explanation for non-revision:** I decided not to revise because in the first two sections I explain that I suggest understanding the right to spirituality as a claim-right, i.e., a right that it is the duty of the society to provide. Examples of such claim-rights include the right to security, something that the government uses public money to guarantee to everyone. A claim-right is different from a right to buy a luxury commodity, for example, in that it is not a duty of the public to provide this, yet nonetheless one has the freedom to buy such a commodity. In addition, throughout the article and again in the concluding section, I argue for a change in the way secular societies understand themselves, not as anti-spiritual cultures but rather as traditions with their own ways of spiritualizing. Since spirituality is a basic need and thus a **claim-right**, secular societies should see themselves as responsible for providing the opportunity to practice spirituality, just as they see themselves as responsible for providing education, parks, or neighborhood playgrounds. I conclude on page 11: "Every secular person or community has a claim-right to practice contemplation, and to enjoy *leisure 2* and spiritual life in a form embedded within their own tradition. Therefore, it is the duty and responsibility of governments and local authorities to provide secular children and adults the opportunity to publicly practice philosophy, just as they provide education directed to the world of *work*, or parks, playgrounds, and basketball courts for *leisure 1* activities".

1. Responses to the Yellow remarks of reviewer 1 in the text's body

* Page 9 in reviewer 1's file: "does the secular society take away such kind of right? Or what the author means in this context?" Response: Secular society simply doesn't see itself as responsible to provide it.
* Page 9 in reviewer 1's file: Is it the feature of the secular societies? If we take, for example, the culture of the modern Iran, will be the understanding of leisure wider?" Response: Yes. Without judging Iran or Iranian society in terms of its spiritual practices or their quality—and it is profoundly different from secularism's spiritual tradition as I describe it—in Iran the public sphere is open to the possibility to spiritual practices.
* Page 10: However, there is a question of the personal life: if a person doesn’t practice spirituality, this could be this person’s deliberate choice. Response: Of course. I am not suggesting the imposition or enforcement of anything upon individuals, only provision of the option to practice spirituality. This is rather like a neighborhood basketball court: no one is forced to play, but they may choose to do so.
* Page 10: if there is no difference between today-secularism and 19th century’s  
  secularism? Response: I didn't look for such differences. Rather, I use the two examples, from the nineteenth century and 21st century, to emphasize my point regarding the ongoing missing element in secular culture.
* Page 16: According the text, leisure 1 is “not a necessary mode”. As examples, author enumerates the famous figures (Socrates) or positive fictional characters (Atticus Finch, although this one had leisure 1). However, who considers it as unnecessary? The thing author calls leisure 1 plays very important role in the life and culture of modern society. Its neglecting leads to burn-out. Response: The mental mode that reviewer 1 believes plays an important role our life is not, in my suggested model, *leisure 1*, but rather *work*. It is *work* because it has the quality or characteristic of fulfilling a need. I write (Page 5): "Thus, *work* includes calming the baby down, watering the plants, getting a haircut, going to the gym, shopping, eating, holding an umbrella to keep us dry, paying for health insurance, calling a distant friend to keep in touch, driving to the beach, and even the simple act of sleeping in order to satisfy one’s biological needs and remain healthy." *Leisure 1* on the other hand is a mental mode of distraction from reality, e.g., someone has a need to sleep, but nevertheless keeps on watching a silly TV series.
* Page 17: "However, is it correct in every case? Is it possible for a person  
  to learn something during having fun (watching movies or traveling) and then to  
  use it in working process?" Response: If one is watching a movie, reading a book, or traveling whilst in a contemplative mode, then the activity is not totally in a *leisure 1* mental mode. And so, one can learn something. But if a person were to try, in *leisure 1 mode,* to watch Kurosawa's *Seven Samurai* or Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey*, to read Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, or to explore an old archaeological site, that person would certainly quit the activity without delay.
* Page 17: " What kind of practices is it? Examples? Response: Blind belief in astrology, extreme nationalism, extreme and fanatical sympathy for a certain football club. Note that I have added these examples to the text at the same spot.
* Page 19: "However, philosophy, science, and art are working  
  activities for privileged people , or does the author means something different?" Response: These activities can be practiced as means, not to *change* reality, but to observe and contemplate it.
* Page 20: "Above we read that leisure 2 assumes the observing reality as a whole. Why in leisure 1 a person cannot observe the various aspects of reality?" Response: By definition, while in leisure 1 mode, one distracts oneself from reality. It is a time when one expects reality to match one's wishes as perfectly as possible.
* Page 20: "In which way observing the various aspects indirectly leads to the wholeness? The explanation needed." Response: What I meant is that contemplating the unchangeable aspects of reality may indirectly lead to insights. Such insights cannot be the motivation or aim of the contemplative mode, but if they manifest they can contribute to bettering our understanding of reality. I have given three examples afterwards.
* Page 21: Why Socrates? Is it possible to call Ancient Athen’s society *secular*? Response: This example is just an historical documentation of people's general inclination to work and to focus on earthly matters.

**Reviewer Two**

* SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS: Please copy and paste the comments or suggestions left by Reviewer Two.

1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding

* The author addresses an area that is still too widely underexplored, i.e., the place of spirituality and religion in secular societies.
* The thesis is original and the author properly situates the discussion within existing literature (acknowledging appropriate historical and contemporary sources), and the author also locates differing supporting elements/subtopics within the context of current academic and popular discussions and concerns amongst citizens.

1. Conceptual Model

* The author does make connections with existing theories and creatively constructs a secular spirituality via philosophy and the concept *Leisure 2.*

1. Explanatory Logic

* The author demonstrates sound logic in terms of the scope and focus of the topic.

1. Implications and Applications

* In the section the author says, “*Although this type of contemplation is by definition for its own sake, it nevertheless indirectly leads the observer to insights regarding the nature of reality as a whole, its potentialities, and a clearer understanding of one’s place within reality. These insights may contribute to the mode of work and everyday life. For instance, they may serve to improve moral and political norms (e.g., Locke’s concept of a natural right common to all human beings, which inspired concrete moral and political developments); they may reveal unknown possibilities concerning matter or the physical realm (e.g., Newton’s understanding of forces and motions), or new perspectives on one’s personal, familial, or social life (e.g., Freud’s ideas of human psyche and culture*).” The author certainly identifies philosophical-theoretical examples but not specific everyday examples.
* I wonder if the author considered more concrete examples of applications. For instance, should philosophy be a more fundamental part of educational curricula at all levels? Should we include philosophers and readings beyond the Western tradition?
* This may be outside of the scope of the author but worth a note of explanation.

1. Quality of Communication

* The quality of communication is excellent. The author writes clearly and explicates the ideas of heuristic thinkers appropriately.
* REVISIONS MADE: Changes made as a consequence of SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS or numerical scores.

1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding
2. Conceptual Model
3. Explanatory Logic
4. Implications and Applications

* I wonder if the author considered more concrete examples of applications. For instance, should philosophy be a more fundamental part of educational curricula at all levels? Should we include philosophers and readings beyond the Western tradition?
* This may be outside of the scope of the author but worth a note of explanation. **Revision made:** I added the following text which gives an everyday example. I also qualify the idea of expecting practical implications from contemplation. See page X: [To add the citation]

1. Quality of Communication

* **REVISIONS NOT MADE:** If SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS are not incorporated into your revision, please list and explain with reasons for rejection.

1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding
2. Conceptual Model
3. Explanatory Logic
4. Implications and Applications
5. Quality of Communication