

March 11, 2010

Dear Mr. Galanter,

Thank you for your reply. It appears that you are questioning whether my refusal to fight you in the Courts regarding your desires is disingenuous. I am not clear what your reasoning on this is, however I am less concerned with “protecting my good name and image” than I am with obeying and honoring my Father. To that end, if you truly have a concern that I have in some way done dishonestly, I will prayerfully consider what you have to say.

You wrote that you find it curious that I am unwilling to cooperate when formerly we were willing to contend for our rights before a judge. Surely you understand the difference between providing an answer to the court when it asks for a reason for our faith and actions, and what it demands of us now. After having ruled our faith illegal, it is now requesting my help in its destruction – or more accurately, it is being requested by those who have pushed the Court into making a ruling on religious matters that is resulting in the attempted destruction of my faith. I am unclear regarding how you would refer to my unwillingness to give you information as not “arguing over my legal rights.” You are not asking for argument – you are demanding compliance for something that I cannot give.

To that end, I am further puzzled by your offer to work with me to narrow your requests so that they do not present an undue burden. I do not believe I was unclear regarding the fact that to give you any information would amount to assisting in persecution and is patently against my religious convictions. Unless you are offering to work with me to the extent that you withdraw your subpoena altogether, it would seem that you are offering to haggle with a man who has nothing to give.

To imply otherwise – to file motions with the Court complaining of undue burden when that is but a technicality – this would truly be disingenuous. To tell the Court or yourself that I cannot answer because you request too broad of a spectrum, when the truth is that I still could not comply with a narrowed one – this would be as disingenuous as attending mediation when it is known beforehand that there is no room to compromise.

The most puzzling part of your letter by far, however, was your assertion that your client “fully supports and seeks to protect religious liberties, and is not interfering with the practice of our religion or beliefs in any way.” Of the various potential motives and justifications for writing this, I will adopt the most charitable possible, and assume that you have only carelessly missed the repeated and clear assertions over the course of this lawsuit to the contrary. I will restate it here for your convenience:

The religion of Creation Seventh Day Adventism requires its adherents to identify themselves individually and corporately by this name.

Allow me to phrase that another way: The practice of our religion and beliefs requires us to call ourselves, both individually and as an organization, both publicly and privately, as a people and as a Church, by the name God gave to us for that purpose.

If you are inclined to take leave to explain **how** you and your client are “supporting religious liberty” by using Courts to force people to surrender something that is not only a part of their religion, but that your

clients themselves teach as a “fundamental belief” of Christian living (e.g. acceptance of Ellen White’s writings as a source of “guidance and correction”), I would be very interested in seeing your reply.

It would seem that the only possible ways for your statement to be true, i.e. “it does not desire to and is not interfering with the practice of your religion or your beliefs in any way,” are either that you are not seeking to keep us from identifying ourselves as Creation Seventh Day Adventists, or that we do not believe that doing so is a part of our religious beliefs. Obviously these are both false, as there is no lack of paperwork to establish the former, and no lack of religious writings to establish the latter. As we are both fully aware of these things, I find it difficult to conceive of any honest line of reasoning you might have employed to justify this absurd contention.

As I have stated once before, I cannot assist you in this case, nor will I fight you for the Court’s approval of that course of action. If you wish to call down its condemnation on me, you may do so freely and without opposition.

My faith requires me to use the name Creation Seventh Day Adventist in reference to myself individually and my Church corporately, as the name that God gave to us for that purpose.

It forbids me from joining with or supporting any organization that seeks to use civil power to force men to violate their conscience – whether it is the name God gave them for purposes of identification, evangelism and education, or whether it involves the day they are to keep as holy to Him.

It most certainly forbids me from actively aiding such an endeavor, whether against myself or others, by any means whatsoever. “For he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds.” (2 John 2:11)

No offers to settle for “less information” will satisfy what I have plainly stated are my convictions. I can give you no support, information, or finances. If you are truly concerned with presenting an undue burden to myself or others, then I suggest that you and your clients withdraw the lawsuit that is seeking to force a violation of our faith and convictions, and the subpoena that has resulted from it. Those truly concerned with respecting – and especially protecting – the religious liberty of others could do no less.

In conclusion, I cannot compromise my faith, nor can I go against my convictions, whether at the threat of losing my livelihood, my freedom, or my life. This is true whether or not the Court were to rule for or against a motion to quash your subpoena, or any other proceeding I might endeavor to start.

I cannot give you information.

I cannot give you finances.

I will not fight you.

All that remains is whether you and your clients wish to push the Court for my “blood,” as it were, in response.