

OPINION

Guest Editorial Bond's Broadcast

KENTUCKY'S 55th GUBERNATORIAL ELECTION

"Counting Kentucky's Governor"

By Paul L. Whalen

Since 1792, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has had 56 Governors. Kentucky's 54th gubernatorial election in November 2007 will determine whether it keeps the 56th or Governor or elects a 57th Governor.

Most Kentuckians are unfamiliar with the majority of the individuals who have served as Kentucky's Chief Executive or Chief Magistrate as some have described the office of Governor.

Very tumult in elections has declined over the past century. The May 2007 Primary Election vote turnout was less than 20% of those eligible voters statewide.

In an effort to help Kentuckians become more familiar with the history and achievements of some of its past Governors, I am writing this column for the next 18 weeks. Each week, I will highlight the life and work of three to four Kentucky's Governors. It is hoped that this will help you understand some of the issues and challenges facing Kentucky's Governor and the Commonwealth have changed in the past 210 years.

Segments of it are scheduled to be heard on the Kentucky News Network (KNN) as well.

1792-1808

Kentucky's first 3 Governors dealt with issues concerning public safety as seen by the involvement with the State Militia as well as issues of concerning putting together instruments of representative government as seen in the creation of counties and writing new constitutions.

The US Congress enacted

See GUEST Page 4

The Carlisle Mercury

The Carlisle Mercury (USPS 023-152) is published every Wednesday by The Carlisle Mercury, 117 Locust St, Carlisle, KY 40311.

Periodicals Postage Rates are paid at Carlisle, KY 40311.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to The Carlisle Mercury, PO Box 272, Carlisle, KY 40311.

Member of Kentucky Press Association and The International Society of Weekly Newspaper Editors

2007 SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$25.00 for one year in Nicholas County, \$30.00 elsewhere in Kentucky and \$35.00 out of state. Subscriptions include state tax where applicable. All subscriptions payable in advance.

Head Office: Marilyn Bond, Creative Manager

Head Office: Becky Tucker, Office Manager

Head Office: Carl Bond, Thomas Crutcher Staff

Head Office: Karlton Matins, News Editor

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Carlisle Mercury welcomes letters to the editor. Letters must be signed and include a daytime phone number for confirmation. Unconfirmed letters will not be published. Unsigned letters will not be published. Members are not published. We reserve the right to edit any publication of letters and to edit letters for content.

The deadline for letters is 5 p.m. Monday.

Send letters to: Editor, The Carlisle Mercury, P.O. Box 272, Carlisle, KY 40311

Letters may also be e-mailed to editor@thecarlislemercury.com. However, if e-mail is used, the sender should call 606-289-6422 to confirm that the letter was received.

HOW TO REACH US

Mailing address: P.O. Box 272, Carlisle, KY 40311

Phone: 606-289-6422 Fax: 606-289-6400

Internet: www.thecarlislemercury.com

Email for advertising: advertising@thecarlislemercury.com

Online: www.thecarlislemercury.com

DEADLINES: Editorial copy deadline is 5 p.m. Monday. Advertising copy with proof deadline is 5 p.m. Monday. Advertising copy without proof, 10 a.m. Tuesday. Classified advertising deadline 10 a.m. Tuesday.

PHOTO-ELECTRONIC ADVERTISING: Color, black and white and digital photos are all accepted. Digital photos should be submitted in the jpg format and can be emailed. Old photos will be accepted at any time. Please do not submit newspaper clippings or photographs. Photos may be picked up after they are published in the newspaper. Electronic Advertising must be submitted in pdf format and can be emailed to the above address.

LEGAL ADVERTISING: First-Aid, Six-7, Deadline 5 p.m. Monday.

All submitted copy must be signed and include a daytime phone number.

The Carlisle Mercury reserves the right to reject any submission in its newspaper. While it is the policy of the Carlisle Mercury to accept advertising copy, the publisher reserves the right to not accept advertising copy if it is not in the best interest of the newspaper.

Advertisements requesting the advertising company and shall include return address. The Carlisle Mercury is not responsible for the return of unsolicited advertising copy. The publisher will not be held liable for the return of unsolicited advertising copy. The publisher will not be held liable for the return of unsolicited advertising copy.

It's just unbelievable! What in the world is going on in this country?

I've had to read and write columns about local events and local happenings. How could this start with the most recent.

The president - and commander in chief whatever that means - has commuted the sentence of Lewis "Scooter" Libby to make it so the criminal serves no jail time for identifying a Central Intelligence Agency agent and putting her life, and that of her family, in jeopardy.

What he did was a felony. He should have the penalty for what he did. Big deal that the president said Libby would have to pay the fines and be on probation.

Libby's see - we fine people \$25 for not wearing a seat belt, which is arguably an intrusion on civil rights when we let those who commit treason off with a fine and probation.

You don't think it's treason to betray a person in the CIA whose life can certainly be on the line in his or her job - then let's call it obstruction of justice, then.

Libby was convicted of several counts of perjury and obstruction of justice. Not only will there possibly be less people who risk their lives as CIA agents, there is a loss of integrity at the federal level which cannot be replaced.

It's hard to see what happened. At what price of politics should we put lives

and screams at us if we don't feel his fast enough. And generally, when it is all gone, he really gets angry. But once he starts running he is fine.

Some will still be planning their other foods too. I plan on making a salad. I'm not sure if it is much cheaper than buying it in the jars.

That was not fair. The mother becomes the loving provider of the infant, nurturing it as it grows - much

and I come to you. I should have before they were born. Because I think our household is a business.

On another note, it is getting cooler and cooler to visit home. I'm getting so excited. I hope to be able to visit some of you around town during my visit. If you do see me, please make sure to let me know that you read my column. My parents tell me of an excited to meet some of you.

Until next week, make it a great one! (And don't forget to wish my Daddy a Happy Birthday!)

Any

received an E-mail claiming a soldier in Iraq had contacted Starbucks (the company that he had asked them if they could send the troops some coffee.

The E-mail said the soldier received a letter back from Starbucks refusing to provide the request because the corporation was against our troops. At first, I thought it was a joke, but I read the letter and it was true and suggested I write about it in my column.

I was in a fight against Starbucks is a vicious lie that went out to tens of thousands of people. Truth is Starbucks has made donations to the troops and, like most of us, fully supports our military men and women.

There are evil people out there who want you to believe that Americans are against our troops. A large majority of Americans are against the war, but very few demagogues would be against our troops (because they are a small minority).

I teach Middle Eastern history. It's astounding how many of the students come up with: people talking their own lies.

See TALKING Page 4

Tom Paston died recently. He was one of the original cast members who performed the great comedy skits on the Tonight Show from 1954 to 1967 when Steve Allen was the host. His comedy skits on the Tonight Show were Tom and Emmy as "best supporting actor."

Tom gained more fame later as one of the stars of Mork And Mindy with Robin Williams. He told me he loved working with Williams, calling him the most talented actor/comedian he had ever worked with in his long career.

There were some drawbacks, however, to being around the hyperactive comedian. Tom said being around Williams 8 to 10 hours every day caused him to have to seek medical help for exhaustion.

In the 70s, Tom was the lovable and goofy handyman, George, Ugly on the Bob Newhart show. He and Newhart were lifelong friends. In 2001, Tom married Suzanne. He shared his love of his performances.

A good friend of mine, John Hart, who now lives in Florida and reads the columns on the Internet. E-mailed me and said he

in jeopardy? And then we go through the motions of trying to pretend to be the same as anyone else. What's going to happen? This is not a better life? Take it or leave it - like it or not - Republican or Democrat - this is a choice of power.

It's like what has gone on in the state of Kentucky. We have political leaders who have also humbled their collective noses at the system.

How dare a governor say he shouldn't be guilty because he has been out there for so long? It's like what I see in my state.

You get elected...or appointed by an elected official. It's ok... unless you are a common person, working for a living, then the penalty cannot be so easy. Justice has found some things. And so, for another week, thanks and sorry.

thumb at the American Judicial System. Libby should be accountable to the president and the vice president had no prior knowledge.

Trusting it actually gets worse. Not only does it appear they know about it, they've covered it up. Take it or leave it - like it or not - Republican or Democrat - this is a choice of power.

It's like what has gone on in the state of Kentucky. We have political leaders who have also humbled their collective noses at the system.

How dare a governor say he shouldn't be guilty because he has been out there for so long? It's like what I see in my state.

You get elected...or appointed by an elected official. It's ok... unless you are a common person, working for a living, then the penalty cannot be so easy. Justice has found some things. And so, for another week, thanks and sorry.

Just before this 4th of July, I was watching the news about upcoming Independence Day celebration plans and the commemoration of the birth of our nation.

That phrase jarred a memory loose that took me back to the 8th Grade. As part of a city-wide competition, all students were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

It struck me as unusual how little the Revolutionary War seemed to impact the relationship between America and horrible bloodshed were given the assignment to write a patriotic essay about the "Birth of Our Nation."

OPINION

Fourth District Report

Don't Politicize Intelligence Funding

By Geoff Davis

The world watched recently as car bombers attempted to target innocent British citizens in Glasgow and London.

These attacks were ultimately unsuccessful, but the care of our environment is a serious issue that our government should address. I do not believe this necessitates the time, talent or specialized resources of our intelligence community.

In fact there are over a dozen government agencies currently studying climate change and its impact on our

evolution theory, or about the public display of Christmas decorations, we always hear claims that the Constitution guarantees the separation of church and state.

But that isn't what the First Amendment says. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

As a matter of fact, the term "separation of church and state" never appears in the Constitution. It stems from a letter Thomas Jefferson composed in 1802, claiming that the amendment built "a wall of separation between church and State," which was different from the original intent.

It should be clear, however, that the original intent of Freedom of Religion was to prevent the government from giving preference to one religion over another. At the same time the states were ratifying the federal Constitution, they were drafting their own state constitutions. Even so, they

still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

See STEVE'S Page 7

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

but I do not support the manner in which the Democrats have allocated resources for our intelligence community.

The most egregious example is the fact that the Central Intelligence Agency has been directed to study climate change.

While we can all agree that the care of our environment is a serious issue that our government should address, I do not believe this necessitates the time, talent or specialized resources of our intelligence community.

In fact there are over a dozen government agencies currently studying climate change and its impact on our

evolution theory, or about the public display of Christmas decorations, we always hear claims that the Constitution guarantees the separation of church and state.

But that isn't what the First Amendment says. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

As a matter of fact, the term "separation of church and state" never appears in the Constitution. It stems from a letter Thomas Jefferson composed in 1802, claiming that the amendment built "a wall of separation between church and State," which was different from the original intent.

It should be clear, however, that the original intent of Freedom of Religion was to prevent the government from giving preference to one religion over another. At the same time the states were ratifying the federal Constitution, they were drafting their own state constitutions. Even so, they

still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have rendered these provisions unenforceable, their existence in the original state constitutions reflect that the current interpretation of "separation of church and state" is very different from the original intent.)

Still require state legislators to hold certain religious beliefs. Tennessee's Bill of Rights, for example, requires the belief in a Supreme Being and the belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. (Although recent Supreme Court decisions have