

Church-State Relationships

In 1997 I read a letter to the editor in our local newspaper concerning prayer in public school. I guess it incensed me, because I wrote this lengthy letter to the editor in response. I never sent it. You've heard it said that getting the right answer is a matter of asking the right question. The right question for the Christian community is not, "Should we mandate prayer in school?" We should be asking, "In a multi-cultural society, how do we establish and preserve a national culture without sacrificing our individual beliefs?" You see, that's not as emotionally charged as the first question, nor is it as easy-to-answer. It's more inclusive than exclusive. It strives to preserve and build relationships, instead of breaking them apart. And it's far harder to achieve. That's why we need to ask it. I believe the reason we're not asking it, is two-fold. First, I don't think the Christian community wants the answer. Second, I don't think what we used to call The Establishment wants the answer either. It's a matter of power, influence, and self-affirmation. We'd all like to reshape the world in our own image. Some are eager to do that, and some don't want the hassle. And so there's always a group that wants to exercise control, and there's always a group willing to give it to them. It's our fallen nature hard at work. We need to watch those who hold the reigns of control, whether in the Church or in the World, because it's a temptation for them to abuse their power.

© July 21, 2005 by William H. Gross – www.onthewing.org

Non-Religion is a Religion

Christopher West's letter to the editor on November 28th did an excellent job of pointing out the need to separate church and state. As a Christian, I also want to separate church and state. However, like so many of our citizens (including some distinguished members of the Supreme Court), Chris has elevated non-religion to a religious status. He is demanding that we not abridge his right to freely exercise his non-religion by allowing the presence or competition of any other religion. This does great harm to the separation of church and state. A religion is the expression of our beliefs about the supernatural, whether personalized in God, or depersonalized in a form of an overarching power, like the Ground of All Being. A belief that there is no supernatural, and no God, is still an expression of religious belief, even when it is expressed in the negative. Chris writes, "If you have a 'moment of silence' you still endorse religion over non-religion." Well, not really. A moment of silence could include personal meditation that isn't focused on the supernatural. Nonetheless, Chris would rather exclude religion from the schools than permit its free exercise as our Constitution guarantees.¹ Chris wants non-religion to predominate in our public schools. I assume he believes that we can be non-religious without being anti-religious. I disagree. If he wants the schools to be free of God and the supernatural, then he opposes all religions except Atheism.

Atheism is itself a belief-system. It isn't a non-religion. It centers on the existence and authority of God, just like any other religion. Atheism literally means "against God." In opposing God as a source of truth and authority, Atheism doesn't do away with gods. Instead, it replaces a

¹ First Amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" I suppose the argument could be made that the local school board can prohibit the free expression of religion because it is not the Congress, and its policy is not a law. It is, however, a government entity. As such, it must comply with the Federal Constitution under the restrictions which flow out from the 14th Amendment. But that's another story. I might also point out that the Founders didn't object to religion in the public square or in the schools. They objected to establishing a particular religion or favoring a particular denomination over the others (see page 6). That is not the interpretation the courts are now giving to this amendment.

supernatural God with natural Man, as if he were a god. It worships Man's innate moral character. It subscribes to ethical and behavioral rules developed by men. It asserts either expressly or tacitly that people are the only judges of right and wrong, whether they make their judgments individually or corporately. Such a belief-system governs its practitioners' choices and actions just like any other religious system. I have no objection to that, nor do I object to Chris's desire to express his beliefs (or non-beliefs). But again, Atheism is a religion like any other, and it should not be allowed to drive competing views from the schools. If public schools exclude all religions except Atheism (non-religion), then the government would be establishing a particular religion in the schools in direct violation of the First Amendment. Alarming as that sounds, it's exactly what happened during the last half of the 20th century. Public schools became increasingly anti-religious, and pro-Atheist. Let me give just a couple of anecdotal examples from my experiences as a public school student in the 1960's. I wasn't religious at the time, so I don't think I'm being biased in this regard.

Anti-Religion is a Policy

My school textbooks tended to ridicule all religions except Atheism (garbed as Science). They portrayed them as superstitious nonsense, and suggested that religious beliefs were unworthy and unwelcome in the marketplace of ideas. It seemed to me that they characterized people of religious conviction as ignorant bigots. They were zealots who had no concept of the truth, couldn't think for themselves, and were intolerant of other views. My textbooks associated the Crusades, the Inquisition, and the Salem witch-burnings with religious conviction. Short stories like *The Lottery* drove home the point. Textbooks taught me (correctly) that the state's opposition to the teachings of Copernicus and Galileo was prompted by the church's teachings on science. But they didn't tell me that those teachings were not contained in the Bible. They didn't tell me they were the teachings of Aristotle and Ptolemy, who predated the Church. These Egyptian and Greek teachings were institutionalized by Thomas Aquinas in the 1200's, and that's how they became part of the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. Like I said, I was never given that level of detail in school. Instead, I was presented with an amorphous entity known as "The Church," which was portrayed as belligerent and ignorant, a persecutor of Science, and a murderer of innocents.

Historically speaking, such abuses were actually committed by the state, not the church. That's what prompted Protestants in America to separate church and state. They knew firsthand that whenever the state involves itself in church matters, bad things happen. And whenever the church petitions the state to enforce its teachings, bad things also happen. This antipathy between church and state, espoused by American Protestants, was cloaked by my schools in favor of feeding me required novels like the *Scarlet Letter*. Once more, the church was portrayed as an intolerant persecutor. It was an anti-religious book, and I passively adopted that point of view for myself.

Transition from Policy to Proselytizing

Public schools are beyond being anti-religious. The State has now developed its own belief system, with its own truth. It promotes and enforces its belief system through institutions like the public schools just as if it was an established religion. It believes that "evolution proves there is no God. Science knows best. Government is an agent for good in the world. Government will protect and provide for us." Now, this religion is not directly codified in the Constitution or in the law. Rather, the laws are prompted, influenced, and interpreted according to the current social norms of

the ruling elite in America. Their norms happen to conform to the belief system of Atheism. This isn't some kind of conspiracy theory. The presence of a liberal elite class is well-known. Its beliefs have been identified and documented. The elite constitute the majority of the media, such as reporters, journalists, and corporate heads. That gives them persuasive power over the general public. They are the majority of our college professors. As such, they run our teachers colleges as well. That gives them persuasive power over our public schools, over our business and corporate leaders, and over our government servants. They are the majority of our Law School professors. That gives them persuasive power over our attorneys and judges. Thus, the belief system (the religion) of those who rule in America, has found its way through the schools into the very mechanism that prohibits the establishment of religion: the Constitution. This was not unforeseen by the founders. They intended religion to influence government, but they did not intend government to influence religion. Yet that's what has been going on, and it continues. Let's look at the original design to see where we went awry.

Removing Checks and Balances

In a tripartite government like America, the Constitution is a reactive or stabilizing force, while the Congress is the adaptive or progressive force. The Constitution inhibits change, reflecting and maintaining the desires and intent of the Founders. The Congress meanwhile promotes change, reflecting the current desires of the people in a changing world. One might hope for an uneasy balance between stability and progress. One might hope that the Constitution, under the care of the Judiciary, would remain neutral as disagreements arise between the various factions of American society. Unfortunately, the Judiciary has begun to take a stance on matters that were considered beyond its authority when this country was founded. It has an agenda of its own. That's because it has a belief system of its own. It is taking sides in the national debates. Matters formerly left to the states and to the people under the 9th and 10th amendments have slowly been assumed by all three branches of the Federal government with the Court's help. Through the 14th Amendment, such federal views have been imposed on the states, and on the people. One faction, we could say, has risen to the top, gained access to the reigns of power, and is now forcing its belief system on the rest of us, using the media, schools, and courts. Again, this is not a conspiracy. It is the natural progression of any belief system as it seeks to influence its world. But that's no excuse for allowing it to perpetuate itself at the expense of the rest of us.

If you hadn't looked at it this way before, consider that when the courts became activist under Chief Justice Warren in the 1950's, we started on a road toward oligarchy. Nine people appointed themselves the conscience of the nation. They became the sole arbiters of right and wrong, designers of congressional laws, and overseers of executive power. Separation of church and state, inherently expressed in the separation of powers under the Constitution, was undermined. The Supreme Court abdicated its role as preserver of the original intent of the Constitution, and chose to interpret it according to current social opinion or personal beliefs (e.g. Roe vs. Wade). If the Court would no longer interpret the Constitution according to the intent of those who wrote it, then they were free to make it say anything they wanted. In setting aside strict construction, they removed the only stabilizing force in American government, and unleashed the Leviathan.² This was the primary

² *The Leviathan* was a political treatise written by Thomas Hobbes in 1660. Along with John Locke, he greatly influenced the thinking of many of our Founding Fathers. He described government as a large beast that must not be overfed or it will turn and devour those who feed it. When we yield power and authority to the government that should belong to individuals, we feed the

contention at the confirmation hearings for Judge Bork in 1987. He was a strict constructionist, interpreting the Constitution in light of its authors' intent. He firmly believed that it is neither the role nor the right of the courts to make law. They are only to determine if the laws made by the congress, as enforced by the executive, are constitutional. The Judicial Committee, both Republican and Democrat, rejected Bork's views. They refused to restrict the power of the federal courts to make new law and create new rights, or to remove old ones. The issue of prayer in schools will not be objectively decided according to the Constitution. It will be subjectively decided according to the personal opinions of nine Supreme Court Justices.

The problem with an activist court is that they represent and enforce their own beliefs, rather than the beliefs of the people or the intent of the Founders. Thereby they abuse the Constitution. Moreover, the justices are not subject to election or removal. If they were neutral and ruling only on the constitutionality of the laws, there wouldn't be an issue. If they could be removed, there wouldn't be an issue. But once they go beyond the wording of the Constitution, interpreting it in ways never intended by the Founders, our rights and our freedoms are forfeit. The Constitution is our rule book, preventing abuse by those who occupy positions of power. If the rule book can be rewritten by the Supreme Court, then there are no rules, and no protections against tyranny. The Constitution of the Soviet Union was a model of democracy and fairness, yet its interpretation always favored those in power, overruling the rights of the Soviet people. It made a mockery of constitutional government. We are on that path today in America.

The State as Parent

It gets worse. To impose their belief system on our children and bypass parental control, Federal and state governments are more and more taking a Spartan approach to child-rearing. They believe that children are wards of the state. That belief has found its way into Administrative Law. Parents are being relegated to the status of care-givers who must be overseen by state agencies, doctors, and law enforcement authorities. Experts in child-psychology and social programs are called as witnesses in the courts against the parents. They challenge parents' beliefs and the way they raise their children, often removing the children from the home. These experts have been indoctrinated in an Atheistic belief system themselves. The question in the courts as well as in the schools is which of these two belief systems will be favored: religious or anti-religious.

Those experts who challenge a God-less view of life in our colleges and universities find it difficult to obtain certification and retain employment. Those who accept the God-less view, who graduate and gain tenure, are the ones who testify before the courts and the congress. They are the ones who craft our laws. Those laws then govern the Administrative Agencies. They also determine the school curricula for our children. Even private schools must conform to the curricula established by the State. In other words, the State has assumed the role of parent; it is passing on its beliefs to our progeny. Children are being indoctrinated in a God-less belief system.

Now, all education is indoctrination whether it's done by parents, schools, or corporations. That's not the problem. The problem is the context and the content of the material. In this case,

beast. In other words, when we consider the government an agent for good instead of considering it a necessary evil, we are prone to overfeed it. He also spoke of ecclesiastical government with the same type of disdain, saying that the church must lead by persuasion, not force.

Atheism is the context, and Science is the content. What's wrong with that? Isn't Science a valid standard of truth? Well, not in the social sciences it isn't, and the social sciences are primarily based on social *beliefs*, not science. These systems cannot be tested, nor can their results be consistently reproduced. For the most part, the beliefs of these experts are nothing more than conjecture. How can we tell? When a judge calls a psychiatrist as an expert witness, and the psychiatrist testifies that a rapist is cured, the judge will not hold the alleged expert liable should the offender rape again. But the judge would have no hesitation holding a bridge engineer liable who testified that his bridge wouldn't collapse. All the social scientist is offering is his or her opinion. If the outcome predicted cannot be guaranteed, then an "expert" non-religious opinion is no more valid than a non-expert religious opinion. Meanwhile, religious leaders are being prosecuted in the courts for giving moral advice, unless they have been licensed by the state as psychologists and psychiatrists. That means the State favors those who agree with its anti-religious belief-system, and it has begun to license those who do not, forcing them to subscribe to a belief system they disagree with.

State Control of Alternative Schools

The last strongholds of government-free instruction are home-schooling and parochial schooling. But this type of education comes at a price. As I said, the State still determines the curriculum. In many cases, it licenses private school teachers, even at religious schools. And it demands that it be paid its tuition, even if it isn't incurring the costs of educating the children. The teachers unions lobbied for that. All privately educated children pay double-tuition as the penalty for separating themselves from the State's belief-system. That sure sounds like the State is trying to suppress or regulate alternative education programs, and to limit the impact of religious beliefs. You might wonder what difference this makes. After all, the State can't control what we think. That's true, but the State can coax our children into adopting the State's belief system while they are still in their formative years, before they've learned critical thinking. Thus, the State creates a new generation of followers. This was the approach taken by the Nazi's and the Communists, and it works. That's an uncomfortable comparison because we're the good guys. But once we understand that government in all forms is inherently opposed to personal freedom, we can appreciate the danger involved in allowing our government free reign. That's one reason why Cal Thomas has said that "the public school system cannot be reformed. It must be done away with."

Can Republican Democracy exist under Atheism?

The question we want to ask as Americans, is whether Atheism is a viable substitute for the Judeo-Christian foundation on which our nation was built? Will reading Atheism or some other religion into the Constitution unravel the fabric of America? The founders of our nation definitely thought so. They didn't believe that man is inherently moral and capable of self-government. They did not believe America could succeed without God's blessing and the continuing religious convictions of its people. They were convinced that man is inherently evil, and that the style of our government must be structured to protect us from our own corruption. They rejected the idea that man is innately good. They held a Puritan view in this regard. In the late 1800's, the Puritan view was supplanted by an Arminian view which, like Atheism, teaches that man is basically good. Which view does our government school system teach today? The Atheistic and Arminian view. I believe there is a direct correlation between what is taught in public education, and the current widespread belief in man's inherent goodness. I want to discuss how that change in the American

belief-system came about.

The Original Goal of Public Education

First, let's turn back the clock to the late 18th century. What did our Founders believe about religion and the state? Here is a statement of the relationship of government to all religions as it was contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith. This document was known around the world for a hundred years prior to the American Declaration of Independence. This particular chapter was widely accepted in America as the standard for church-state affairs. It is reasonable to assume that it under-girded the Constitutional Convention. The following excerpt is slightly paraphrased:

Chapter XXIII - Of the Civil Magistrate

1. God has established political powers that reign under Him for the good of the people and for His own glory, to use force if necessary to defend the good and punish the bad.
2. It is lawful for Christians to participate in politics, to pursue piety (obedience to the law), justice and peace and, when necessary, to wage war.
3. The political powers cannot administer the Word and sacraments, nor may they evangelize, teach or preach. Yet it is their obligation to protect the Church without preference for any particular denomination so that all may be free to discharge their religious duties. All people, whether in the Church or opposed to it, should be protected by their government from any indignity, violence, abuse or injury and to maintain such order that all religious assemblies may be held without molestation or disturbance.
4. It is the duty of the Church to pray for the government, to honor its office-holders, to pay taxes, to obey the law, and to acknowledge governmental authority. A difference of opinion about religion does not free the authorities from their responsibility to maintain religious freedom, nor may they act on behalf of particular religions or non-religions to oppose or oppress the Church, particular denominations or particular religious views.

Horace Mann understood this church-state relationship and chose to accommodate it in public education. He founded public schools in hopes of standardizing opportunity through standardized knowledge. Together with Thomas Jefferson, he hoped to build a moral people, worthy and capable of participating in a vibrant democracy. They wanted an educated public that would be skilled in critical thinking so they would be less likely to be led down the primrose path by the empty promises of politicians. Jefferson strongly believed that if religion were removed from public life and from schools in particular, then this democratic experiment would fail. Without a moral people there can be no justice, and democracy cannot survive in an unjust society.

However, in the 1940's, John Dewey reformed the Public School System under a new theory of social engineering. He did so in opposition to religious schools, and for the avowed purpose of stamping out their pernicious superstitions (to quote Tacitus). After sixty years of this reformed public school instruction, we've only succeeded in swapping one belief system for another. We have installed Atheism and Scientism in place of godliness and holiness. In America, we don't want a state-run religion, whether we're religious or not! The Crusades and Inquisitions were state-run.

Prayer and charity, by contrast, are individually practiced. When the State promotes and institutionalizes its own belief system, it becomes one nation under Man, not one nation under God. Based on our current crime rates and prison construction, it seems fairly obvious that we were better off under God than we now are under Man. We no longer have public schooling as Mann envisioned it. We now have government schooling as Dewey envisioned it.

Truth as a Moving Target

The State *cannot* be the source of truth and authority in a democracy. The people are that source. But the people are currently divided in their view of truth. We are “diverse” in our opinions. I believe that the State has instigated the diversity we see, creating a conflict of opinion by its direct interference in the education of our children and our leadership. If the ruling elite, using the force of the State, is going to enforce their opinion over everyone else’s, without regard to an objective standard like the Bible or the Constitution, then “might makes right.” The State will enforce whatever opinion wins at the polls. Worse, it will enforce by law the opinions of whoever contributes the most to a political candidate’s election campaign. If lawmakers can be bought, then we have private laws that are necessarily inconsistent. Without an objective standard of truth, there is no need to reconcile incompatible views. They can exist side by side.³ And that’s what we see.

Moreover, the ruling elite are busy molding national opinion, forming a consensus, through the schools and the media. The objective standard of truth has fallen victim to personal opinion voiced through polling data, and changing trends of political correctness. The Constitution is being interpreted according to those polls and trends. Is that what we really want? Do we want our rights to depend on who’s in office and current fads? Do we want the personal opinions of nine Supreme Court Justices to over-rule an entire congress on non-Constitutional matters? Do we care what the teachers unions think about abortion? Our laws are based on a moving target of public opinion shaped by well-funded, narrow-focus lobbies. The majority is being silenced, over-ruled by a small group of social elites who hate what America stands for, and its religious heritage.

Tolerance as Abdication

Here’s a snapshot of one such anti-religious campaign: Carl Sagan, that great priest of Atheism and Game Theory (Parade Magazine, Nov. 28th 1997), tells us that anyone who follows the Golden Rule is a loser. Tit for Tat is the only way to go. Always consider an enemy your friend if that’s useful in the short term, and drop your friends like a hot potato when they don’t assist you in your personal goals. Boy, that’s much better than the Golden Rule, don’t you think? Be a user, not a loser. There’s an uplifting moral value for you. And that’s exactly what the schools were teaching my children in the 1980’s and 1990’s.

When I teach my children a different set of values at home, those values are scoffed at or minimized by the schools. My children are taught that all religions are the same, and no one religion is better than any other. They are told there are many paths to heaven (well, if you believe in that sort

³ This is the contribution of the Evangelical Church, which is anything but consistent. Its ecumenical fervor has caused it to abandon its creedal and confessional standards of truth. Why should the political arena be any different for those who subscribe to such a subjectively based theology? If it’s all about me in church, then surely it’s all about me in society as well. “Let’s not argue over doctrine. Can’t we all just get along and be tolerant of everyone’s views?” Sound familiar? Atheists love it.

of stuff), so don't be so sure you have the right answer. Be tolerant and accepting of others' beliefs. How absurd! If I didn't think my belief system was the right belief system, I wouldn't have any beliefs! Isn't that obvious?? Competing belief-systems are NOT equal! They are NOT equally correct! Truth by its very nature is exclusive. Saying one thing is true necessarily makes other things false. My Atheist, Jewish, and Muslim friends believe in their worldview just as strongly as I believe in mine. None of us takes our beliefs lightly. We live our lives by them, judge by them, condemn by them, uplift by them, encourage by them, motivate by them, reward by them, and draw comfort from them when times are hard. But it was Judeo-Christian beliefs that formed the basis for American laws, morals, and behavior. That social consensus is coming to an end. It is the lack of consensus as to an American belief-system that is tearing this country apart!

Cultural Diversity

America is supposed to be a melting pot, not a stew. Cultural diversity will destroy the social fabric that we have known for 200 years if it means throwing away the principles that under-girded the Constitution at its inception. Who man is, what his nature is, and how his appetites are governed, are all part of the Constitution. The document uses a Judeo-Christian belief-system to assess and define those human attributes. The government structure we developed is a response to those attributes. Prior to the writing of the Constitution, James Madison lectured the Congress for weeks on the nature of man. He used Scripture, literature, and history books to make his point. The conclusion they came to was that Man is basically corrupt and selfish. He needs to be protected against himself. He is NOT basically good, nor can he be made so simply by giving him the proper education. That opinion is made explicit in *The Federalist Papers* which promoted the Constitution and defined the ideals of the American Experiment. And yet, my children were taught the opposite when they attended public school. Have we forgotten our roots? Did Dewey succeed?

If you substitute the animism of Africans, the tokenism of Native Americans, the karma of Buddhism, the animosity of Islam, or the beliefs of any system other than Judeo-Christian, you will shred the Constitution. That's what the Supreme Court has been attempting to do since Earl Warren led it. The civil disorder we are now experiencing is a direct outworking of that court's own bankrupt belief-system. A culture (i.e. a shared belief system) cannot survive when there is no clear majority of shared beliefs. Opposing points of view will only be tolerated when there is a clear majority. As an opposing belief system approaches the same influence as the mainstream system, civil disorder *must* follow. That's a fixed law of political and social science. They are competing in the marketplace of ideas, and there will be no peaceful co-existence. Welcome to the culture wars!

The mass-media are presenting views shared by less than 2 percent of the population, and yet their products from magazines to movies are the focal point of my children's education, required to be read and seen in the public schools. They have an unwarranted influence on my children that I am powerless to control. If these media moguls were responsible, there wouldn't be a problem. But they are panderers to our basest instincts and desires. They will promote whatever entices an audience to watch or read. If that's sex and violence, then the product will be sex and violence. As a group, they are amoral and proud of it (their justification: truth is relative; we only reflect the public attitude, we don't influence it). They are no better than pimps on a street corner. They portray children as if they were adults in speech and behavior. They refuse to insulate them from the excesses of the adult world. They steal childhood innocence and, as with our courts, they demand that children be treated

the same as adults, with all the "rights" but none of the responsibility.

Contradictory Beliefs

What's that got to do with church-state relations in public schools? The schools required my children to watch TV shows and movies that I would not permit in my home ("R" rated). They taught my children that they didn't have to obey me, or take my advice (handing out condoms and inviting pro-abortion Planned Parenthood teachers to train them). They told them they could make their own choices, and exercise their own volitions, without my oversight or permission (how and where to obtain an abortion without parental notification). Those shows and movies were teaching a belief system that contradicted the one I was trying to teach my kids. They dealt with morality and beliefs, not just with facts. I don't object to character and morality being taught in the schools. That's exactly what I want. But I want schools to reinforce what I teach at home, not undermine it. That's impossible to do when the belief system of the schools contradicts my own belief system.

I didn't *want* my kids to exercise choices that carried severe consequences. They were kids! The reason we deny adult rights to kids is to protect them from the consequences of acting on those rights. They can't drive before 17, because it takes a certain level of physical coordination and judgment to maneuver a two-ton vehicle without injuring someone. They are forbidden from having sex until they're of the age of majority in order to protect them from the consequences of too-early parenting. We demand that sex be restricted to marriage so that the mother has a legal right to support from the father. What good does it do to demand support from a 14-year old father who can't hold a job? Is it so wrong to restrict the rights of children for these reasons? But the courts have declared that my children have sexual rights that I am not permitted to interfere with.

The State didn't rock my daughter to sleep, or tell her how much she was loved. The state didn't encourage her to pursue her dreams. Yet the State, through the school, told my child that she could choose whether to have sex. The State withheld the fact that the probability of getting pregnant during sex is two out of every hundred times – and it could happen the first time as well as the hundredth. They convinced her and her classmates that a condom would prevent pregnancy. Will the State help my child raise her own child at age 13 or 15? No. Will the State pay the medical bills incurred if my child comes down with AIDS, acquired by this 'right' to sex? No. Will the State comfort and help these newborn children who live in poverty because they have been raised by children? By hand-out only. You see, the State says these child-parents have no right to a job, and no right to sign a contract. The State has consigned these children to a life of poverty by condoning and advocating their adolescent choices, and blocking parental oversight. Statistically, these out-of-wedlock children will also succumb to a life of crime. The State will then petition all of us for more prisons, and better schools.

Besides free sex, the State believes in divorce. It ignores the sanctity of marriage because it doesn't believe that marriage was instituted by God. That contradicts my beliefs as well. Because of its belief, the State readily authorizes divorce. The bitterness and anger that result from broken families spill out into our streets. The State is the offender and a co-conspirator in these travesties. Our government leaders are blinded by their Atheistic beliefs. The State entertains the sexual appetites of our children on the one hand, and then punishes them with whimsical marriage and employment policies on the other. In doing so, it irreparably harms them.

The media likewise promote this pedophilia. Yes, pedophilia. Pedophilia is treating children as if they were adults, fully capable of giving informed consent. Children cannot give informed consent. They are children! They lack the legal and moral capacity to consent to acts that may jeopardize their future. They don't have the experience to know any better. They need protection, not liberty. But the TV shows, movies, and magazines continue to portray 13 and 14-year old girls as sex goddesses, dressed and made up to look as though they are sexually active. And so our children become sexually active. Sex without commitment has led to marriages that end in divorce.

Conflicts of Interest

The State and the media are not amorphous entities any more than the church. They are not faceless institutions. They are groups of men and women who act in concert to effect and enforce their beliefs. These men and women need to be held accountable. Take the media's role in the Constitution. We granted the media First Amendment rights, called "Freedom of the Press." Why? To keep the public adequately informed so that we can remove inept and corrupt politicians, judges, police officers, corporate leaders, and other public and private servants. Prior to Election Day, have you seen the media objectively assessing the performance of any of these people? I haven't. Why not? These are also their advertisers and their Administrative Overlords. If the media cannot or will not do their duty to inform us under the Constitution because they have a conflict of interest, then why should we continue to grant them privileges under the First Amendment?

The media is no longer "The Press" as the Founders intended. It is now a corporate enterprise. By law, corporations are accountable only to their shareholders. In the corporate world, the press is an entertainment industry with a paying audience. It is subject to mergers and to influence by those it has a Constitutional charge to oversee. It has become the voice of public opinion, with the requisite power and authority to shape that opinion. It wants to govern and affect policy, even though its members are unelected (that's a theme). Its members now frolic with the rich and famous as one of their own, overpaid for their celebrity status, and as likely to make the news as to report it. They interview each other as reliable sources. The Press has become the very beast that it was designed to tame. I think it's time to review our public policies. It seems that the State has become a demigod if you will, and the Media is its High Priestess. They share the same worldview. They were educated in the same schools, and indoctrinated by the same mentors.

Big Brother Lives

In George Orwell's book, *1984*, we are introduced to a falsely compassionate Big Brother. He says his only concern is the mental and emotional well-being of the citizenry. Orwell would not be shocked by the progress made by the State in America – even though he was writing about the evils of Atheistic communism. The liberal elite in America freely practice their Atheistic beliefs in our judicial, legislative, and executive branches. They promote their beliefs through corporate policies that exempt the guilty from liability, and rob the elderly of their retirement funds. But most insidiously, they teach their beliefs in the schools, indoctrinating our children in a religion that the State claims is not a religion at all. In my child's school, Jocelyn Elders bestowed the right of sexual passage on my daughter, and with it, the burden of unwed motherhood. Like Big Brother, the State said it knew what was best for her. My daughter was too young at the time to recognize that the State

actually wanted to enslave her, when it should have been her slave. She was conned into believing that her rights derive from the State, and not from God. This deception must end. Let me quote from the Declaration of Independence:

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, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness -- That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers *from the Consent of the Governed*, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it.

Our schools must be freed from the influence of the State if we are to remain free. Public schools were intended to teach us the evils of government, and to develop the character necessary to maintain our freedom from tyranny. They were not intended to teach us the goodness of government, and the irrelevance of character. Schools cannot teach truth as long as the State controls the schools. The government has become destructive of those ends by involving itself in education, like a fox invading the hen-house.

Prayer in public school is not the issue. That's a ruse. We don't need to keep religion out of the schools, and putting prayer in schools won't help. We need to get the State out of our schools, and out of our homes. The leadership positions in America are now dominated by atheistic elites, like some kind of landed aristocracy. Through the schools, courts, and media, these men and women have for decades been denigrating the beliefs held by a large majority of Americans. In their arrogance, they have been stealing the affections of our children for over half a century now. They have been proselytizing those who can least resist their God-less libertinism, and we have let them get away with it far too long. This is an issue which impacts Americans of all persuasions, religious and non-religious alike. If some of us are not free to hold our beliefs without State sanction, then none of us will be free. The State isn't our friend, and it has never been an agent for good. It is a necessary evil that requires a strong leash and a starvation diet. It's time to pull the leash tight, and push the bowl away – if we still can.