"SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE" IS A PROVEN MYTH!

By William Taylor Reil

When asked, almost everyone who knows anything about the issue at all will say that "Separation of Church is in the 'First Amendment' to the Constitution of the United States."

With respect to religion, the "First Amendment" states:

"***Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;***"

Are you surprised to discover that no such words as "separation of church and state" are to be found in the "First Amendment"? Most attorneys and judges believe, or say they believe, that these words are contained therein.

However, if pressed to show you any evidence that the First Article of the "Bill of Rights" (which is an integral part of the Constitution for the <u>u</u>nited States of America) states anything about "Separation of Church and State", they, particularly attorneys, judges and professors of law, will usually resort to saying that the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES has decided that is what the "First Amendment" means, and therefore "Separation of Church and State" is in the Constitution. It is true that since 1947 A.D. the SUPREME COURT has so decided, but it is **not true** that the founding fathers, who wrote the Constitution for the <u>u</u>nited States of America, with its "Bill of Rights", ever intended for there to be separation of Church and State. Neither did the framers of the 1776 A.D. Pennsylvania Constitution.

Most Pennsylvanians, and others, know that one of the major reasons the colonists came to Pennsylvania, and to the other 12 original colonies, was for religious freedom. What most do not know, is that when both the first Pennsylvania Constitution was written and adopted in 1776 A.D. and the "Bill of Rights" was ratified in 1791 A.D. as an integral and required part of the organic

Constitution for the united States of America, the word "*religion*" as used in these two fundamental law compacts/contracts (and in all other documents of the time in Pennsylvania and America), meant "**denomination**" or "**sect**" of Christianity. Also, little known is the fact that one well known motto of the War for Independence, or as it is now called "Revolutionary War", was "***No king, but King Jesus***".

The founding fathers intended (as an examination of the historical records reveal) to insure by the "First Amendment" that there would not be any single central or federally sponsored denomination. Many State Citizens that were asked to ratify the federal Constitution in 1787 A.D. recalled the oppression of the Church of England; as well as, the earlier years in some of the colonies and in several of the young States after independence when one denomination ruled and oppressed all others. Those individuals involved at the time knew that all of the united States of America were Christian nations. They simply demanded as a condition of ratifying the proposed Constitution for the united States of America that the federal government not be able to create a central Christian church of any one particular denomination or sect. George Washington assured those in the several States that a "Bill of Rights" would be the first order of business of the new federal government that was to be created by the Constitution being ratified. This he did. The result, from the many State proposed amendments and modifications, was the issuing of twelve proposed Amendments. Of these, ten amendments were ratified by the State Conventions and thus, those ten amendments became the "Bill of Rights" of the federal Constitution.

George Washington, President when the First Congress wrote the "First Amendment", stated the following, among other things, in his 1796 A.D. "**Farewell Address to the People of the United States**":

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. ---

In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Man & citizens. --- The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect & to cherish them. --- A volume could not trace all their connections with private & public felicity. --- Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? --- And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. --- Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of particular structure --- reason & experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle. ---

'Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is necessary spring of popular government. --- The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of Free Government. --- Who that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric."

James Madison, founding father and the primary author of the Constitution for the <u>u</u>nited States of America, wrote the following in 1778 A.D.:

"*We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future ... upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, to sustain ourselves, according to the Ten Commandments of God.*"

The original Delaware Constitution of 1776 A.D. states the following in Article 22:

"*Every person, who shall be chosen a member of either house, or appointed to any office or place of trust .... Shall .... Make and subscribe the following declaration, to wit:*
"I, _____, do profess faith in God the Father, and in

Jesus Christ, His only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed for evermore; and do acknowledge the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration."

Similarly, in the "Section the Tenth" of the 1776 A.D. Pennsylvania Constitution, the following is found:

"*I do believe in one God, the creator and governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked. And I do acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine inspiration.*"

Noah Webster, who, among other things, wrote the first American Dictionary, served in two State Legislatures, was a judge and the first founding father to call for a Constitutional Convention, wrote the following concerning his unmistakable convictions concerning the relationship between Christianity and government:

"The religion which has introduced civil liberty, is the religion of Christ and his apostles, which enjoins humility, piety and benevolence; which acknowledges in every person a bother, or sister, and a Citizen with equal rights. This is genuine Christianity, and to this we owe our free constitutions of government. ….
The moral principles and precepts contained in the Scriptures ought to form the basis of all civil constitutions and laws … All the miseries and evils which men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery, and war, proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible."
[History of the United States, by Noah Webster, (New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1832), pages 300 and 339]

Founding father Patrick Henry stated:

"*It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionist [pluralism], but by Christians; not on religions, but on the gospel of Jesus Christ! For this very reason peoples of other faiths have been afforded asylum, prosperity, and freedom of worship here.*"

In 1892 A.D. the United States Supreme Court stated, among other things, the following in its Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States [143 U.S. 457 (1892)] opinion:

"This is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation. The commission to Christopher Columbus … [recited] that "it is hoped that by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered…." The first colonial grant made to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584 …. And the grant authorizing him to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony provided that "they be not against true Christian faith …." The first charter of Virginia, granted by King James I in 1606 …. Commenced the grant in these words: "… in propagating of Christian Religion to such People as yet live in Darkness…."

Language of similar import may be found in subsequent charters of that colony … in 1609 and 1611; and the same is true of the various charters granted to the other colonies. In language more or less emphatic is the establishment of the Christian religion declared to be one of the purposes of the grant. The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims in the Mayflower, 1620, recites: "Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith … a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia …"

The fundamental orders of Connecticut, under which a provisional government was instituted in 1638-1639, commence with this declaration: "…. And well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union … there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God … to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess …. of the said gospel [which] is now practiced amongst us."

In the charter of privileges granted by William Penn to the province of Pennsylvania, in 1701, it is recited: "… no people can be truly happy, though under the greatest enjoyment of civil

liberties, if abridged of …. Their religious profession and worship…."

Coming nearer to the present time, the Declaration of Independence recognizes the presence of the Divine in human affairs in these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights…"; "… appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions …."; "And for the support of this Declaration, with firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

This 1892 A.D. United States Supreme Court opinion included examples from each of the then existing forty-four State Constitutions and then continued its historical discussion for several more pages. Finally the Holy Trinity v. U.S. , supra, opinion concludes with the following:

"There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons: They are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people. While because of a general recognition of this truth the question has seldom been presented to the court, yet we find that in *Updegraph v. The Commonwealth*, it was decided that, "Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been, a part of the common law … not Christianity with an established church … but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men." And in *The People v. Ruggles*, Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American Law, speaking as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, said: "The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice … We are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors [other religions]." And in the famous case of

Vidal v. Girard's Executors, this Court … observed: "It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is part of the common law …." These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declaration to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation."

This United States Supreme Court case stands as a very convincing and extensive argument! The Court quoted directly from eighteen sources, alluded to over forty others, and acknowledged "many others" and "a volume" more from which selections could have been made. In total over eighty-seven references were given in this case opinion to prove that this is a "Christian nation".

The referenced cases above may be found at their respective cites as follows: Updegraph v. The Commonwealth, 11 Serg. & R. 393 (Sup. Ct. Penn. (1824); The People v. Ruggles, 8 Johns 545 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. (1811); Vidal v. Girard's Executors, 43 U.S. 126 (1841).

For over 150 years after the ratification of the Constitution for the united States of America, the States were considered the highest source of authority. Most disputes were settled by State courts with the State Supreme Court of each State as the final court arbitrator. The federal Supreme Court only had jurisdiction in a limited number of cases which included such issues as: disputes between States, cases involving federal territories not yet States and import taxes. As the Court itself noted in the Holy Trinity case, it had few opportunities to decide on the issues affecting Christianity.

Updegraph v. The Commonwealth, supra, is the first case cited in the Holy Trinity , supra, opinion and is particularly note worthy since it is a Pennsylvania Supreme Court case opinion which has never been overturned. In this case the Court settles the question about Christianity by stating the following on page 400:

"We will first dispose of what is considered the grand objection --- the constitutionality of Christianity --- for in effect that is the question.

Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been, a part of the common law of Pennsylvania; Christianity, without the spiritual artillery of European countries; for this Christianity was one of the considerations of the royal charter, and the very basis of its founder, William Penn; not Christianity founded on any particular religious tents; not Christianity with an established church, and tithes, and spiritual courts; but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men."

The Updegraph opinion goes on for several pages explaining in great detail the exact understanding of the day as to the true depth to which the "Holy Experiment" in Pennsylvania was based on Christianity, true Christianity. Make no mistake, many sins have been, and are, committed in the name of Christianity. Nevertheless, the sins of men do not, nor can they, in any way change the fundamental fact that Christian principles and morality, revealed in the both Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible, King James version, are the foundations of all laws and institutions of government in Pennsylvania and all other States in the united States of America, as well as the federal government.

The Holy Bible and Sir William Blackstone's COMMENTARIES on the LAWS OF ENGLAND in four books (first written in 1758 A.D.) were the primary sources of law, for teaching and in the courts of America during the late 18th century, when the Declaration of Independence, the 1776 A.D. Pennsylvania Constitution, the organic Constitution for the united States of America with its "Bill of Rights", and many other historical documents were written in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in America. The words in these Constitutions and other documents mean the same today as they did when they were written. The words must be interpreted and understood in the language of the common law as it existed at the time and place when each of these documents was written.

Blackstone's COMMENTARIES , on pages 41 and 42 of Volume I, section II "OF THE NATURE LAWS IN GENERAL", states:

"**Human law must not contravene nature. ---** This law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.

But in order to apply this to the particular exigencies of each individual, it is still necessary to have recourse to reason, whose office it is to discover, as was before observed, what the law of nature directs in every circumstance of life, by considering what method will tend the most effectually to our own substantial happiness. And if our reason were always, as in our first ancestor before his transgression, clear and perfect, unruffled by passions, unclouded by prejudice, unimpaired by disease or intemperance, the task would be pleasant and easy; we should need no guide but this. But every man now finds the contrary in his own experience; that his reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error.

This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine Providence, which, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce its laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the holy scriptures. These precepts, when revealed, are found upon comparison to be really a part of original law of nature, as they tend in all their consequences to man's felicity. But we are not from thence to conclude that the knowledge of these truths was attainable by reason, in its present corrupt state; since we find that, until they were revealed, they were hid from the wisdom of ages. As then the moral precepts of this law are indeed of the same origin with those of the law of nature, so their intrinsic obligation is of equal strength and perpetuity. Yet undoubtedly the revealed law is of infinitely more authenticity than that moral system which is framed by ethical writers, and denominated the natural law; because one is the law of

nature, expressly declared so to be by God himself; the other the law only what, by the assistance of human reason, we imagine to be that law. If we could be as certain of the latter as we are of the former, both would have an equal authority; but, till then, they can never be put in any competition together.

Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these; …"

The meaning for the words "Laws of Nature and Nature's God" used by the founding fathers in the opening paragraph of the "Declaration of Independence" is thus found in Blackstone's COMMENTARIES. The "Laws of Nature" are our "Father's Will" and the "Revealed or Divine Law " (Laws of Nature's God) are to be "found only in the Holy Scriptures." Remember, "no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, all their authority … from this original".

So where did this concept of "Separation of Church and State" come from? The answer can be found in the 1947 A.D. SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES "case opinion" (there is no such thing as "Case Law") of EVERSON v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, 330 U.S. 1 (1947). In its majority opinion, the Court, without any precedent, historical facts or authority, announced: "***The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach.***" The alleged authority for this totally new position by the Court was Thomas Jefferson's 1802 A.D. letter sent to the Danbury Baptist Association in Connecticut to reassure them that there would be no national religious holiday established by the federal government. The portion of this letter used by the 1947 A.D. SUPREME COURT, in an attempt to justify this absurd and treasonous opinion, was clearly taken out of context, misquoted and misapplied in EVERSON v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, supra. In point of fact, Jefferson's January 1, A.D. 1802 letter states:

"*I contemplate with solemn reverence that of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Thus building a wall of separation between Church and State.*"

President Jefferson was responding in an effort to eliminate the concerns of a group of Baptists in Connecticut, a denomination of which he was not a member. Jefferson, apparently wanting to relate to these well meaning Christian Americans, borrowed the words "*a wall of separation,*" from the writing of a very prominent Baptist minister, Roger Williams. Williams' words had been: "*When they have opened a gap in the hedge or wall of separation between the garden of the church and the wilderness of the world, God hath ever broke down the wall itself ... And that there fore if He will eer please to restore His garden and paradise again, it must of necessity be walled in peculiarly unto Himself from the world ....*"

Obviously, according to Williams, the "*wall of separation*" was intended to protect the "garden of the church" from the "wilderness of the world." That "wall" was clearly always understood by Thomas Jefferson (evident from other writings on the subject), and all others at the time, to be a one-directional wall to protect the church from government.

Jefferson's letter to the Danbury Baptist Association remained obscure, as do most other presidential documents prepared for specific audiences, until 1878 A.D., when it appeared in the case opinion of Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. 145 (1878). In this United States Supreme Court opinion the Court included much of Jefferson's letter with its context clearly presented. In Reynolds, supra, the Supreme Court used Jefferson's letter to dispel the idea of "separation of church and state" advanced at the time by the Mormons who were attempting to keep the government from interfering with their practice of polygamy. Here the Court

showed that the government was prohibited from interfering with opinions of religion, which is what distinguishes one denomination from another. However, the government had the constitutional authority and responsibility to enforce civil laws according to general Christian standards. Thus the Court ruled that the Mormons' practice of polygamy and bigamy was a violation of basic Christian principles, and therefore, was unconstitutional.

Having extensively studied the so-called 14th Amendment history and correctly concluded that it is, and always has been, unconstitutional, this writer avers that the Supreme Court did not have jurisdiction to hear the Reynolds matter and thus apply the "First Amendment" within a State. (The so-called 14th Amendment issue is discussed in much more detail in other documents on the CSBP website.) Having said this, nevertheless the Supreme Court did rely on Jefferson's letter to defeat the alleged "separation of church and state" argument in 1878 A.D. and 1892 A.D..

Jefferson's letter thereafter laid dormant for nearly 70 more years. Then, in the 1947 A.D. case of EVERSON v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, supra, the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES extracted eight words from Thomas Jefferson's letter ("*a wall of separation between church and state*") and thus created out of thin air the new meaning of the "First Amendment."

Also in 1947 A.D. the case of ADAMSON v. CALIFORNIA, 332 U.S. 46 (1947) was before the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES. Justice Hugo Black stated the following in his dissenting opinion of this case:

"*My study of the historical events that culminated in the Fourteenth Amendment, and the expressions of those who sponsored and favored, as well as those who opposed, its submission and passage, persuade me that one of the chief objectives that the provisions of the Amendment's first section, separately, and as a whole, were intended to accomplish was to make the Bill of Rights applicable to the states.*"

By a 5 to 4 majority the ADAMSON Court rejected Black's analysis of the historical record and declined to apply the first eight amendments of the "Bill of Rights " to the states. However, since that time the Court has steadily increased the "Bill of Rights" incorporation into the first section of the so-called Fourteenth Amendment, as Justice Hugo Black had wanted. This new, totally unfounded or supported, meaning of "Separation of Church and State" and its application within the States and in the UNITED STATES have grown in importance ever since EVERSON, supra, and ADAMSON, supra.

The following are a few of the many court holdings and case citations for decisions (opinions) that have continued the judicial efforts to "take God out of the public square" since 1947 A.D.:

1. A verbal prayer offered in school is unconstitutional. ENGEL v. VITALE, 370 U.S. 421 (1962); Abington v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963)..
2. Religious speech by students in school is unconstitutional. STEIN v. OSHINSKY, 348 F.2d 999 (2nd Cir. (1965).
3. A student praying aloud over his lunch is unconstitutional. REED v. VAN HOVEN, 237 F. Supp. 48 (W.D. Mich. 1965)
4. It is unconstitutional for kindergarten students to recite: "We thank you for the flowers so sweet; We thank you for the food we eat; We thank you for the birds that sing; We thank you for everything." Though the word "God" is not stated, the word "God" is implied in this apparent prayer. DE SPAIN v. DEKALB COUNTY COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIST., 255 F.2d 655 (N.D. Ill. 1966)
5. Erecting a war memorial in the shape of a cross is unconstitutional. LOWE v. CITY OF EUGENE, 451 P.2d 177 (1969).
6. The use or reference to the word "God" by the Board of Education is unconstitutional. STATE OF OHIO v. WHISNER, 351 N.E. 2d 750 (Sup. Ct. Ohio 1979)

7. It is unconstitutional for a kindergarten class to be asked during a school assembly; Whose birthday is celebrated by Christmas? FLOREY v. SIOUX FALLS SCHOOL DIST., 464 F.Supp. 911 (D.C.S.D. 1979)
8. It is unconstitutional for the Ten Commandments to hang on the walls of a classroom since the students might be lead to read them, meditate upon them, respect them, or might obey them. STONE v. GRAHAM, 449 U.S. 39 (1980).
9. Even though the wording in a bill may be constitutionally acceptable, the bill becomes unconstitutional if the legislator who introduced it had a religious activity in his mind when he authored the bill. WALLACE v. JAFFREE, 472 U.S. 38 (1985).
10. It is unconstitutional for a kindergarten class to recite: "God is great, God is good, let us thank Him for our food." WALLACE v. JAFFREE, 472 U.S. 38 (1985).

The list of absurd case decisions goes on and on. However, a closer look at the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES opinion in its 1980 A.D. STONE v. GRAHAM, supra, decision is important to more fully understand how unlawful and un-Godly this Court has become.

In this case the Court held, in part, that:

"*The pre-eminent purpose for posting the Ten Commandments on the schoolroom walls is plainly religious in nature. The Ten Commandments are undeniably a sacred text in the Jewish and Christian faiths, and no legislative recitation of a supposed secular purpose can blind us to that fact.*"

The Court went on to explain its constitutional problem with having the Ten Commandments simply hanging on the walls of schools. The Court stated:

"*If the posted copies of the Ten Commandments are to have any effect at all, it will be to induce the schoolchildren to read, meditate upon, perhaps to venerate and obey, the Commandments.*

…. This … is not a permissible state objective under the Establishment Clause."

So, the first clause of the "First Amendment" (so-called the "Establishment Clause" by the Court) means, according to the SUPREME COURT, that the state (note the use of a small "s") does not want children to have the objectives commanded in stone by God to Moses on mount Sinai. Since the Ten Commandments, according to the Court, are NOT permissible objectives of the state, the state must want children (and all the other people) to: 1. Have others gods before the Lord; 2. Make graven images; 3. Take the name of the "Lord thy God" in vain; 4. Not remember the Sabbath and Not keep it Holy; 5.Not honor their father and mother; 6. Murder; 7. Commit adultery; 8. Steal; 9. Bear false witness; and 10. Covet. Well, since God was taken out of the "public square" by the courts; this, and a great deal more, has been exactly the result(s) in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in America. Just read the major newspapers or listen to the news on radio and television these days. Remember what Noah Webster said about the source of all "*miseries and evils which men suffer*"? --- they "*proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible.*" Noah Webster also said:

"*In my view, the Christian religion is the most important and one of the first things in which children, under a free government, ought to be instructed …. No truth is more evident to my mind than that the Christian religion must be the basis of any government intended to secure the rights and privileges of a free people.*"

Why in the world would any one, but particularly Christians, do anything that such an un-Godly and unconstitutional Court decides?

Simply consider the 1778 A.D. statement by James Madison:

"*We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future …. Upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern*

***ourselves, to sustain ourselves, according to the Ten Commandments of God.*"**

The original intent of the "First Amendment", which is its meaning and intent today, is that those in the federal government, acting for the sovereign people which they are always suppose to represent, are to be totally controlled and governed by the word of God found only in the Holy Scriptures, both the Old and New Testament. Further, the federal government has no authority to interfere with the religious beliefs or habits of the people, unless they explicitly violates Christian principles and morality. Those in State governments are likewise controlled, governed and restricted by various provisions of the State Constitutions. The so-called 14th Amendment is, and always has been, unconstitutional, thus the "Bill of Rights" in the organic Constitution for the <u>u</u>nited States of America <u>only apply</u>, as originally intended, to the federal government.

History cannot be re-written, though many have unlawfully tried to do so. The law is the law, not opinions or "color of law". We the people must learn the truth and always demand lawful and constitutional behaviors and actions by ALL those in governments (as well as ourselves and others) at all times and in all places, or we will be doomed to repeat the misfortunes of the past. God's word is true and is the law! Will we have the "eyes to see and the ears to hear" His unchanging Commandments? Will we follow the law? As in the past, the choice and responsibility are ours, both individually and collectively, but primarily individually. What is your course of action going to be? Now is the time to decide and to act!

Note: To learn more about the subject of "Separation and Church and State", I strongly recommend that you study the book <u>Myth of Separation</u>, (and the many other books, tapes and other materials on this and other related subjects), by David Barton, 1992 & 1993, Published by WallBuilder Press, P.O. Box 397, Aledo, Texas 76008 [817-441-6044]