

## Right to freedom of religion under various constitutional frame work

Dr. Amit kumar Ishwarhai Parmar

Associate Prof, M.S Bhagat & C.S Sonawala Law College Nadiad, Ta: Nadiad Dist: Kheda, Gujarat University Ahmedabad.

### Abstract

Religion has been an integral and essential part of every society. People have been professing and practicing it differently in different societies. It has been observed that when a religion has spread to another region, other than the place of its birth, it has adopted itself, both in terms of ritual and social customs, according to the condition of that country. For instance, Islam in India is not the same as Islam in Arab a country there is, thus, an interaction between the practice of a religion and the geographical, social, economic and political conditions prevailing in the practicing country.

**Keywords:** Freedom. Religion State and Religion; Religion and individual, Secularism. Co-operative. Theocratic.

### 1. Introduction

Religion is, primarily, a matter of faith and belief and as such it has little place for reason. It is for this reason that people become sensitive about their religion and cannot tolerate even a rational or healthy criticism of their religion. Such an attitude of mind gives birth to dogmatism and fanaticism. India is supposed to be a religious country above everything else; Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and the followers of other religions take pride in their faiths and testify to their truths by breaking each other's head. Nehru rightly observed: "The spectacle of what is called religion, or at any rate organized religion, in India and elsewhere, has filled me with horror and I have frequently condemned it and wish to make a clean sweep of it."

Religion is both an integrating as well as a divisive force in a society. History bears evidence to facts that whenever and wherever a religion comes into being, it integrates and unites its followers. Faith and a common ideology bring them together. There can be no doubt that the founders of great religions have been amongst the greatest and the noblest of men that the world has produced; but their disciples and the people, who have come after them, have often been far from great or good. Often, in the history, we see that what was meant to raise or make us better and nobler has made people behave like beasts. Instead of bringing enlightenment to people, it brings darkness to them; instead of broadening their minds, it has frequently made them narrow-minded and intolerant to others. In the name of religion, millions are massacred and cruel crimes are committed.

Religion not only divides the people, but it is divided in itself. A liberal interpretation of the traditional philosophy of a religion leads to the creation of a sect in a religion. These sects assume hostile postures towards each other. This hostility leads to clashes between them and, thus, the followers of a religion cut each other's throats. History is full of the bloody wars fought between the Catholics and the Protestants, Shias and Sunnis, Akalis and Nirankaris. Thus, the problem of religion poses a problem for law and order in a state. Religion is a personal matter but when it assumes these diabolical dimensions and becomes a threat to peace and order, it is natural that the attention of the state be diverted towards it. The plus point about religion is that, to some extent, it helps in the shaping of the personality of the individual. It helps him to grow

as a moral being. It imparts a set of moral values to the individual and gives a pattern of behavior. Thus, religion is important both to the individual and the state. Therefore, in the constitution of a state, religion finds a place. Even those states which are anti-religion and anti-god, give religion a place in their constitutions.

In ancient times, the Greek city-states had their own Gods. Each city-state worshipped its own God and everyone in that city state had a common God. There was no organized religion in Greece. With the rise of Christianity into an organized religion, during the middle ages, the general acceptance was of the principle "Cajun regio ejus religio" that is, he who governs the state, also governs the religion. In other words, the religion of the ruler was the religion of the people. Later on, it was found that this principle led to the establishment of an intolerant state. Citizens, professing a religion other than that of the ruler, were not tolerated in the state. Innocent human blood was shed in the name of the religion and worst crimes were perpetrated both in the name of God and religion. It was observed that the worst tyrannies could not shake the faith of the people. The blood of the martyrs sowed the seeds of tolerance. With the advent of modern age, religious tolerance began to dawn upon human minds. When tolerance appeared on the horizon of scientific thought, the right to religion to the individual was conceded. This right has always been subject to the historical, political and social environment of a country and hence, variations are natural.

On the basis of their attitude towards religion, a casual observer may classify states into theocratic states with an official state-religion and secular states, with no state-religion. But for a keen observer, this classification seems too sketchy as it is based on one single criterion, i.e., whether there is an established state-religion or not. If one goes deeper into the matter, one finds that there are other criteria also and hence, and different variations of both the types.

In attempting to distinguish between variations of the above types, Donald Eugene Smith's model of secular state serves as a useful device for our purpose. According to Smith, there exist three sets of relationship in a secular state. The first set of relationship exists between state and religion, the second set of relationship and religion. These three sets of relationship have

been taken as the basis on which the status of the right to religion in different countries is to be studied and classified.

## 2. State and Religion

The First set of relationship concerns state and religion, and it deals with the treatment accorded to religion by the state. Broadly speaking, in this category, there are four types of states, namely, theocratic, secular, communist/socialist and cooperative States. There are variations even within these types.

### 2.1 Theocratic State

Under the first type, the relationship between state and religion is rather intimate and close. Religion enjoys the patronage of state in the forms of an established state-religion. The United Kingdom, Nepal, most of the Islamic states and many more falls under this type.

In England, there is no separation of Church and State. The Anglican Church is an established church and the King of England is the supreme head of this church. That is why; he has the title of 'Defender of Faith.' This church has been established by the Act of Supremacy, 1534 whereby the King is accepted "as the only supreme head, on earth, of the church of England" which all powers and profits pertaining to that position, and in particular, the right to use all jurisdiction for the repression of error, heresy and other offences as any spiritual authority and ever lawfully possessed. The Act of Uniformity, 1549 prescribed the use of the Book of the New Book though, imposing no punishment on laymen who absented themselves from the services of the church. The passing of the above two Acts of Parliament makes the Anglican Church a constitutional reality. The law of the church is a part of the law of the land and English courts take judicial notice of it. Sweden can also be placed in this category. Like England, there also is a state-church known as the Church of Sweden, which dates back to the 9<sup>th</sup> century at present, about 95 percent of the population in that country belongs to the Church of Sweden. Many constitutions of many Islamic states to one particular religion. Constitutions of many Islamic states give a superior status to Islam. The Malaysian Federal Constitution states; "Islam is the religion OF THE Federation, but other religions many also be practiced." Similarly, Article 4 of the Iraqi Interim Constitution of 1970, and Article 2 of the constitution of Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the opening sentence of the constitution of Kuwait Article 2 of the Constitution of Bahrain, Article 2 of the constitution of Algeria and Article 6 of the constitution of Morocco, uses the same above mentioned phraseology in different ways.

In a similar manner, Catholic and Evangelical faiths have been accorded the status of state-religion in many predominantly Catholic and Evangelical Lutheran countries. The constitution of Argentina states, "The federal government supports the Roman Catholic Apostolic Faith." Likewise, the same phraseology has been used in Article 231 of the constitution of the Republic of Oreo, Article 9 of the Principality of Monaco Article 3of the constitution of Bolivia, Article 2 of the Republic of Costa Rica. Article 37 of the constitution of Liechtenstein state, "Religious liberty and freedom of expression in guaranteed to all persons. The roman Catholic Church is the state-church and as such enjoys the full protection of the state." The Constitutions of Denmark<sup>18</sup> and Norway declare that the Evangelical Lutheran Church shall be the established church of Denmark and as such it shall be supported by the state.

The latest addition to this category is the Republic of Sri Lanka and the Republic of Bangladesh.\* Article 9 of the constitution of the Democratic Republic of Sri Lanka States, "The Republic of Sri Lanka shall give to Buddhism the foremost place and accordingly, is shall be the duty of the state to protect and foster the Buddha Sasna." Similarly, Article 20(1) of the constitution of Burma, as amended, reads "Buddhism, being the religion professed by great majority of citizens of the union, shall be the state-religion."

### 2.2 Secular States

Under the second type, the relationship between state and religion is rather nonexistent as state maintains a neutral stand in matters of religion and thus, remains indifferent to religion. The United States of America is a typical example of this kind. In the original US constitution, there is no mention of either a state-church or religion rights of the citizens. The constitution is silent on this matter and does not express anything directly. Clause 3 of Article 6 of the constitution provides that "No religious tests shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States." Similarly, the right to freedom includes religious freedom along with freedom of expression, speech and other things.

The above neutrality of the American state was further strengthened by the First Amendment of the constitution as early as 1791. The First Amendment laid down that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion of prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The manifest object of enacting this provision was to effect a complete separation of the state from church, and also that religion from now onwards is treated as a private concern of the citizen and the state has nothing to do with it.

At the national level, a secular state was set up but the states were not prevented to have an established church. Massachusetts and Connecticut maintained their state-church till the beginning of the nineteenth century. Besides, any state could theoretically. Impose, if it so desired, restrictions on the liberty of worship. The US Supreme Court finally completed the process of the separation through its judgment, delivered in a case, wherein it declared, "that religious liberty was part of the liberty, which according to the Fourteenth Amendment, and no person could be arbitrarily or unreasonably deprived of by the state."

The separation between church and state, achieved through the combined effect of the First and the Fourteenth Amendment, does not mean that it acts as a restriction on the sovereignty of the American state. The restriction is not one from any outside authority but one which still remains universal. It only prefers to act within certain limits. The church, though separate and autonomous, is still within it. But, some of its affairs, being of a secular nature, are liable to be regulated by the municipal laws.

In Australia also, the constitutional provision whose origin can be traced to the First Amendment of the US constitution, forbids that state from establishing any religion. Australian constitution provides. "The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion." According of F. Cumbrae Stewart, this section 116 forbids:

- (i) Declaring a certain religion to be true and making its principles formally binding on the state;
- (ii) Reforming abuses in an existing religion, and controlling changed in it;

- (iii) Assisting a religion in making its decree anathemata effective; and
- (iv) Giving state assistance in the plantation of a religion in a new area.

Similarly, Article 2 of the Turkish constitution provides, “The Turkish state is. Secular.”

The constitution of Japan provides, “The state and its organs shall refrain from religious education or any other religious activity.” The constitution further states that no religious organization shall receive any privilege from the state, nor exercise any political authority. In the Eire constitution, there is a premise that the state shall not make endowments for any religion.

### 2.3 The Communist State

In the third kind, the relationship of state is hostile to religion. The communist ideology is both anti-religion and anti God’s. The Communist ideology is based on dialectical materialism which is opposed to spiritualism. Spiritualism has its citadel in the church. The communist states are opposed to religion and there is a distinct separation of the church from the state and of the school from the church, so as to allow complete freedom for the exercise of one’s conscience.

The Soviet constitution provides, “In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the USSR is separated from the state and the school from the church.” Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all religions. Under the new revised constitution of the Soviet Union, there is a slight variation on the question of religious freedom. The position taken in the new constitution is “citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess or not to profess any religion, and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda. Incitement of hostility or hatred on religious grounds is prohibited. In the USSR, the church is separated from the state and the school from the church.”

The right to religious freedom is recognized in most of the Communist countries, under the chapter of the fundamental rights and duties of the Citizens. The constitution of People’s Republic of China provides: “Citizens of the People’s Republic of China enjoy freedom of religious belief. “No State organ, public organization or individual may compel citizens to believe in, or not to believe in any religion: nor may they discriminate against citizens who believe in or do not believe in any.”

The state protects normal religious activities. No one may make use of religion to engage in activities that disrupt public order, impair the health of the citizens or interfere with the educational system of the State. Religious bodies and religious affairs are not subject to any foreign domination.

A deeper study of the above article clearly indicates that the freedom of religion in China is not absolute as it is in the Soviet constitution. No one can be compelled to follow a religion. Religious activities cannot be as organized as may be detrimental to law and order, health and the educational system of the state. No country can interfere in the name of religion, in the internal affairs of the state. The constitution of Bulgaria and the constitution of North Korea give right to religious freedom to their citizens.

The Communist states have no uniform policy on the question of the relationship between state and religion. It appears that before World War II, the Soviet Union followed a policy

whereby the right to anti-religion was absolute, but we find that experience has made them wiser and they have diluted the absolute rights. The Soviet Union guaranteed a distinct freedom to profess and practice religion along with the freedom to carry out anti-religious propaganda. Atheism is specially mentioned under Article 52 relation to freedom of conscience. Such anti-religious freedom is not guaranteed under the constitution of any other communist country. It is no doubt that the Communist society has ideologically discarded religion but they have come to pragmatic terms with the social reality of religion. The Communist states that have come into existence after the Second World War have mellowed down their opposition to religion. It is being increasingly felt in these countries that opposition to religion makes people sensitive and, thus, a liberal view regarding religion is taken by some European Communist states.

A remarkable phenomenon, of the state recognizing the religion and regulating it according to the laws of the state, is found in German Democratic Republic. Catholics have become a powerful force in Poland. We find that in a few European Communist countries, excluding USSR, secularism in the sense of anti-religion is absent. The constitution of the German Democratic Republic provides as under:

- (1) Every citizen of the German Democratic Republic has the right to profess a creed and carry out religious activities.
- (2) The church and other religious communities are to arrange and carry on their activities in conformity with the constitution and legal regulations of the German Democratic Republic.”

We have, thus, observed that in the Communist state, the position regarding the relationship of the state religion is the very anti-thesis of the position in the theocratic states.

### 2.4 Co-Operative Secular State

The Fourth type of relationship between state and religion has emerged in the form of the Indian secular state, which may be termed as ‘cooperative secular state’ It is a kind of synthesis between the theocratic and the Communist state. It does not tolerate anti-religious propaganda like the theocratic state, and yet, at the same time, it has no religion of its own. The state gives freedom of conscience and religion but hedges it with restrictions. The state is neither very close and intimate nor cold and indifferent or even hostile to religion. There seems to be a kind of cooperation between state and religion. For the profession and practice of religion, peace and order is very necessary and this is guaranteed by the state, which gives equal protection to all religions. On their part, the religions and religious organizations are expected to organize their activities in such a manner that they are not a menace to public order, health and morality. Thus, religion and state cooperate with each other because both are essential to each other. Canada and India belong to the category of cooperative secular state.

On the question of religion, the constitutional position in Canada is quite different from the United States and England, yet there is as much religious freedom in Canada as in England and America. Like England, there is no state-church in Canada on the other hand, the provision of the constitution of Canada specifically forbids the state “from establishing a religion” Like the First Amendment of the US constitution. The traditional theory is that the Parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures are their legislative powers except the one provided in the constitution. This principle was accepted in the past, but in recent years it has not been fully accepted. It has now been

held that the powers “cover the whole area of self-government within the whole of Canada.” The position, then, boils down to this that the Parliament and the provincial legislatures can enact within their respective fields an enactment touching religious liberty, both in regard to the individual as well as religious establishment.

The Preamble of an Act passed by the Canadian Parliament expresses an impartial sympathy towards all religions, thus, favoring the religious over the irreligious. Unlike the United States, there is no problem with regard to laws which evince impartial sympathy towards the works of religious bodies and establishment but which aid all religions in a non-preferential manner or which prefer in general the religious over the irreligious. Though, the Bill of Rights in an Act of Parliament, not a constitutional Act, but in reflects the tenor of general opinion in Canada, approving cooperation between the church and the state. The Parish and Fabrique Act, 1839 of the province of Quebec is an exception to the doctrine of equality of religion as it confers power to levy and collect assessments, on properties belonging to the Roman Catholics for erection and repair of parish churches, chapels, parsonages, cemeteries, etc. the Act clearly provides that nothing in the Act shall render any class of Protestants or any person, whomsoever, other than persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, liable to be assessed or taxed in any manner for the purposes of this Act.

The Indian constitution, like the Canadian constitution does not associate the state with any particular religion. Like the Preamble to the Canadian Bill of Rights, the Preamble to the constitution of India ‘secular to all its citizens, liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship.’” The framers of the Indian constitution turned down several suggestions to put the word ‘secular’ in Article 1. This was turned down on the ground that it will give India a negative bent on the matter of religion and, thus, restricts the sphere of state activity as in the case of the United States. The state, in India, does not shut its eyes to religion; instead it has an open door policy to all religions through equal treatment to all religions and religious tolerance. In India, religion is an integral part of the life of its people. The state cannot, therefore, divorce religion; rather religion helps the state in the propagation and revival of cherished moral values among its citizens.

### **3. State and Individual**

The Second Set of relationship exists between the state and the individual. This set of relationship deals with the issue of citizenship, as the relation between an individual and the state is that of citizen. The nature of citizenship and the rights of citizen depend very much on the attitude of state towards religion. On this basis, we can classify the states into two broad categories – the theocratic or non-secular state and secular state.

Theocratic states are those states which have a state religion and as such, the citizenship is based on religion. Here too, there are two kinds of states. One category of states is where the citizenship is offered only to those who profess and practice a particular religion. Vatican City is an example of it. Here only those who are Roman Catholic can be the citizens, others are only visitors. Here, the profession or practice of no other religion is permitted.

The other kind consists of the very many non-secular states with their own state-religions. Most of the Islamic states come under this category. Here, religion is the basis of the award of full citizenship in such states, the profession and practice of

other religions is permitted. But the person believing in the state-religion can only become the head of the state and head of the government. Followers of the religion, other than the state-religion, are treated as second class citizens or non-citizen residents. Thus, there are no rights to equality in citizenship. All citizens have to equal rights. Pakistan comes in this category, along with other Islamic states where the non-Muslims can live but they cannot, as citizens, enjoy equal rights with Muslims.

There is yet another type of theocratic states, where inspired by the fact that the state has a religion of its own, the basis of citizenship is secular. In such states, in the matter of civic rights, there is no distinction between the followers of the state-religion and those who do not follow the state-religion. Equality before law and equality of opportunity and status is granted to all the citizens. United Kingdom, Sri Lanka, Denmark and Norway come under this category.

In a secular state, the basis of citizenship has nothing to do with religion. Here, a citizen may profess and practice any religion or even may not profess and practice any religion. Thus, atheists and agnostics have as much right to citizenship as the followers of any religion. Here, religion is a private affair of an individual and in this private affair he is totally free. Here again, there are two broad categories. In the first category are those states which guarantee freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess any religion and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda. In these states, one has an absolute freedom in the matters any religion and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda. In these states, one has an absolute freedom in the matters of religion. He can profess a religion and practice it, but not propagate it. The right against religious propaganda is also permitted. The right against religious propaganda is also permitted. Thus, in the Communist countries, one can criticize or even ridicule religion. The new Soviet constitution has provided that one cannot incite hostility or hatred on religious grounds. Thus, a kind of negative right to religion is accepted in these countries.

In the second category come those states where the freedom of religion means that one can profess, practice and propagate one’s own religion, but he will have no right to do so by injuring the sentiments of others. A criticism of a religion even by the followers of that religion is hardly permitted. Thus, in such states, the right to religion is a positive right. India, the USA, Canada, Australia and Switzerland are some of the examples of such type of states.

### **4. Individual and Religion**

The Third set of relationship exists between the individual and religion, this relationship deals with the freedom of religion. There are two aspects of religious freedom. One is the philosophical aspect of religion which can be explained as conscience, faith and belief. These are a difference between the meanings of these terms. Conscience refers to man’s subjective sense of right and wrong. Thus, freedom of conscience means that a person is free to entertain any belief or doctrine which he regards as conducive to his spiritual well-being. The state cannot enquire into or take notice of man’s religious or moral beliefs. Faith and belief are based either on one’s convictions or on inherited patterns of thinking. They are not based on reason; sometimes, they are opposed to reason as they are based on intuition, sentiments, they are opposed to reason as they are based on intuition, sentiments, emotions and feeling and do not always appeal to one’s intellect. The other aspect of religious freedom is the practical side of the religion which includes the

right to profess, practice and propagate one's own religion or belief. Under Article 25 of the Indian constitution both the liberty of conscience and the right to profess, practice and propagate religion have been made subject to state – control. This can only be a case of inaccurate drafting.

Regarding the philosophical aspect of religion, the freedom of conscience and belief should not be subject to control on the grounds of public order, morality and health. It is solely the concern of an individual to believe or not to believe in any doctrine or faith. Therefore, many countries have granted absolute freedom of conscience, belief or faith to their citizens. The Swiss constitution provides, "liberty of conscience and belief is inviolable." The Syrian constitution of 1930 also states that there shall be absolute liberty of conscience. Similarly; the constitution of Brazil provides that the liberty of conscience and creed is inviolable<sup>[53]</sup>. The constitution of West Germany provides, "The freedom of faith and conscience and the freedom of religious and ideological (Weltanschauliche) profession shall be inviolable<sup>[54]</sup>." In spite of the inviolability of the right to freedom of religion, all these constitutions put "reasonable restrictions" on the practice of religion.

The Swiss constitution lies down that the free exercise of forms of worship is guaranteed within the limits compatible with public order and morality. Likewise, the constitution of Brazil states that free exercise of religious sects is assured so long as they are not contrary to public order or good morals. Similarly, the Syrian constitution provides that the state shall guarantee and protect free exercise of all forms of worship consistent with public order and good moral. The judicial decisions of the American courts also point to the identical views, as cited in the above provisions. Justice Roberts expressed a similar opinion, in his judgment in *Contwell v. state of Connecticut*, when he ruled, "Freedom of conscience and freedom to adhere to such religious organizations or forms of worship as the individual may choose, cannot be restricted by law."

It may be observed that in actual practice, the right to freedom to profess, practice and propagate one's own religion, belief of faith is nowhere in the world an absolute right or an absolute freedom. The free exercise of religion implies certain restrictions. The nationality of these limitations will be determined by the fact of their being conducive to public order, health and morality. This basis is accepted, universally, in all the constitutions where these restrictions are placed.

However, in the matter of freedom to propagate one's own religion, the states maintain different stands. On the basis of these divergent stands, the states can be grouped into following categories.

- 1) In the first category are included those countries where the constitution has specifically granted a right to propagate one's own religion, belief or faith, subject to reasonable restrictions. It may be significant to note that there are very few constitutions in the world that have conferred this right. India can claim to be a pioneer in this field. The right to propagate one's religion has been recognized by the constitution as a fundamental right. The countries that have followed India include the Commonwealth of Bahams, Barbados, Botswana, Guyana, Grenad, Fiji and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.
- 2) In the second group may be include the theocratic states which permit the right to propagate only their own state-religion and prohibit any or all other religious. Under this category, the predominantly Islamic states, like Malaya, can be included. The constitution of Malaya provides,

"Every person has the right to profess and practice his religion and subject to clause (4) to propagate it "Clause (4) of this article provides, "States law may control or restrict the propagation of any religious doctrine or belief among person professing the Muslim religion.

- 3) In the third group, we may include the socialist countries which not only permit the freedom of religion to their citizen but also allow anti-religion and anti-God propaganda. The Soviet constitution states: "Citizens of USSR are guaranteed freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess or not to profess any religion and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda." The 1954 constitution of the People's Republic of China provided, "Citizens enjoy freedom to believe and freedom not to believe in religion and propagate atheism." It may be observed that in the constitution of 1982, freedom to propagate atheism has been deleted. The constitution of Bulgaria provides: "The citizens are guaranteed freedom of conscience and creed. They may perform religious rights and conduct anti-religious propaganda." Similarly, the constitution of North Korea lies down that citizens have religious liberty and freedom of anti-religious propaganda.
- 4) In the last group, we may place those countries which permit the profession and practice of religion, but forbid conversion through propagation. The constitution of Greece can be cited as one such example. It provides that freedom of religious conscience is inviolable but states that "proselytism is prohibited."

From the above survey about the status of right to religion in various countries, this inference could be drawn that the right to religious freedom has been accepted in principle in most of the countries of the world. However, there is difference of degree to which this religious freedom is granted by the state to its citizens

## 5. Conclusion

To conclude, it may be said that the right to religion has been deemed to be a fundamental right, because it has been considered fundamentally important for the development of the personality of the individual as it imparts certain moral values to him, provides a code of right conduct and makes him a social man. Religion is essential both to man and society. Even in the primitive societies, there were certain norms and modes of conduct, some beliefs and faiths which helped to guide the moral life of the tribe. We have observed that the Communist countries did not ideologically believe in religion and had taken a hostile posture towards religion. But, with the advance of time, it has started dawning upon them that anti-religious propaganda or atheistic propaganda does not take them forward. As a matter of fact, they have seen the futility of anti-religion propaganda or atheistic propaganda does not take them forward. As a matter of fact, they have seen the futility of anti-religion propaganda and, hence, their attitude towards religion has been revised and they have, except Soviet Union, done away with the anti-religion propaganda.

The universal importance of religion, both for the individual and the society has been recognized. The UN Charter also accepted its importance. In chapter IX of the UN Charter, it has been laid down, "With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of the people, the United Nations shall promote ... universal respect and

observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.” The Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed, “Everyone has a right to freedom of thought, religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others, and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.”

## 6. References

1. John Witte. Facts and Fictions about the History of Separation of Church and State, cited above at note, 43.
2. Everson V. Board of Education U.S., 1947, 330.
3. John Witte. cited above at note, 123, 23.
4. Lemon V. Kurtzman, 403, U.S. 602, 91 S. Ct 2105, 29 L. Ed, 2nd, 1971, 745.
5. Sherbert V. Verner, 374 U.S 398, Harlan, 1993, 422.
6. Charles Haynes, Oliver Thomas. The Supreme Court, Religious Liberty, and Public Education.
7. (www.ASCD.org). See also Aguilar v. C. Felton, 1985, 43.
8. DE Smith. India as Secular State, Princeton, 1963, 49.
9. The federal constitution of Malaysia, 1957, 3:1.
10. The Iraqi Constitution, 1970.
11. The Hashemite Kingdom Jordan, 1952.
12. The constitution of Kuwait.
13. The constitution of Bahrain, 1973.
14. The constitution of Morocco, 1970.