

# WHITEPAPER – Separation of Church and State

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

- Original intent definitions of separation of church and state have been replaced with contemporary secular definitions
- Legal precedents created from SCOTUS decisions have marred the religiosity of her citizenry
- Religion is being cut off at the knees by secular humanist leaning Supreme Court Justices
- The Secular Humanist religion is being financed and supported by government institutions
- The primary role of religion in her INDIRECT capacity is to help government tamp down the extremes of immoderate behavior from her citizens, now minimized by government intervention and encroachment.

## **FULL ARTICLE:**

In order to have a proper understanding of separation of church and state, we must first supply a definition of what it is and what it is not. Like any tried and tested theoretical analysis in the body politic, we must painstakingly test the "assumptions" that lead us to our political conclusions.

At a 30,000-foot level, I believe that we can make a broad statement suggesting that the affairs of church and the affairs of state should be separate. Simply put, the assumption that the ecclesiastical domain (religion) and the political domain (government) have no business whatsoever intruding in the affairs of the other is a relevant assumption.

And while the Framers stopped short of articulating those exact political sentiments in our Bill of Rights, they came very close when they incorporated both the "Establishment Clause" and the "Free Exercise Clause" in the First Amendment.

### **Proper Definition:**

Assumption #1 - The affairs of religion (church) and the affairs of government (state) should never encroach the authority of the other.

Assumption #2 - The First Amendment tells us that the federal government is never allowed to "establish" a national religion, and in so stating, showing partiality of one religion over another is forbidden. This assumption is portrayed as a negative reinforcement of what the government

is NOT allowed to do.

Assumption #3 - The First Amendment also tells us that the citizens of America have a right to "freely exercise" their religious beliefs. This assumption is a positive reinforcement of what every American citizen has the right to expect. Please note, there are no stipulated restraints on American citizens in this assumption like there was in the "establishment clause" for the government in the previous assumption. This is a key distinction.

Assumption #4 - Because our Founding Fathers put no restraints on the aforementioned assumption, American citizens have every right to "freely exercise" their religious beliefs in the private or public square. In other words, the unalienable right of free religious exercise extends to their civic capacities as well.

Therefore, the assumptions listed above point to a definition of religious freedom sought by our Framers, but not currently defined and recognized in the 21st century. I believe the above assumptions describe the real definition of separation of church and state.

However, we must also define what separation of church and state is not. When doing so, we will stick to a strict interpretation of our Constitution and use an "original intent" understanding.

### **IMPROPER Understanding:**

Assumption #1 - That the Supreme Court decision reflected in *Lemon vs. Kurtzman* adequately and/or accurately reflects the original intent of our Bill of Rights. The decision used "establishment clause" rhetoric and circular reasoning to deny "free exercise" applicability to any decision they choose in the future.

- a. Laws have to be secular in nature
- b. Laws can neither advance nor inhibit religion
- c. Laws cannot entangle the government in the affairs of religion.

This decision is **Clintonesque** in nature and is nothing more than leaving the door open for future courts to further define what the meaning of is- is! i.e. shut down all semblances of religion.

Assumption #2 - The "establishment clause" has been redefined by SCOTUS down through the years to represent guilt by association. In other words, they have so manipulated their definition of separation of church and state that even a hint of religion in the public domain has them crying foul. The "establishment clause" has been weaponized by previous secular leaning

courts in their legal decision-making precedents to allow for this absolute travesty.

Assumption #3 - The secular leaning courts have used the "free exercise clause" to suggest that our free religious exercise can only happen inside the 4 walls of a church building. They would rather change the description from "free exercise" to "freedom of worship." Their redefinition means worship inside of church buildings only.

Assumption #4 - Instead of broadly defining our religious freedom since our Framers included no restrictions to our "free exercise", the secular courts have diminished those rights from the public square including prayer, 10 Commandments, and the Bible. Correspondingly, this is not representative of our Framers' wishes and/or original intent.

### **What SCOTUS and CONGRESS BOTH Missed:**

Instead of working hard at nurturing the symbiotic and complimentary nature of the relationship between church and state, instead they have focused on driving a wedge between the two. Instead of letting the hope and faith that previously undergirded our politics with INDIRECT influence and impact conditioning the immoderate impulses of the citizenry, SCOTUS instead chose the government apparatus to fulfill roles previously held by the church. I am suggesting that the diminutive role created was strategic in design by the secularists.

Unfortunately, the secular leaning Supreme Courts has created another animal with slightly different spots. First, their decisions have fostered the complete and total secularization of society, unrestrained. Second, the nontraditional Secular Humanist religion has replaced traditional religion in most aspects of society. Third, contrary to our First Amendment, our government now has "established" a national religion, the very thing they were trying to avert in the first place.

The Secular Humanist religion and the associated doctrine is being propped up, supported financially, and recognized by the U. S. Government.

Because our government has not been vigilant, the pragmatism and practicality that we find in the politics, public policy, and Supreme Court decision-making in the worldly domain, has distorted, distracted, and then crushed the hope and faith of our upward and onward glance for a brighter tomorrow. We must endeavor to change that dynamic back to the Founders' vision and ideals

Religion, if it is ever to completely develop her earthly commission and responsibility for political restraint, must aggressively undergird our government INDIRECTLY with the force majeure necessary to fulfill her key role.

In conclusion, we want separation of church and state. However, we want the version of separation of church and state that was established 250 years ago by our Framers and the one that most resembles biblical instruction.

LaPierre for Congress  
District 4 - Greenville and Spartanburg Counties

I Like Mike

A serious candidate for serious times!