

Someone Give Elise Patkotak a Chill Pill by Attorney Kevin_Clarckson Posted: June 3, 2009

Elise Patkotak's uncivil, anti-Christian writing Jihad has my brain throbbing. Why can't Elise accept that some people have religious beliefs different from hers? Not everyone shares the Christian faith and all of the Christians that I know can live with this fact, and they can peacefully leave the spiritual fates of others to them and to God (although most Christians are happy to share their faith with anyone wanting to talk and listen, and some work honorably to fulfill Christ's great commission to share their faith), and they can accept that others will answer to God, not to them.

When did it become acceptable to publicly, in general distribution newspaper print, mock and ridicule religious beliefs? I'm just going to leave that one to simmer in the trust that there are reasonable minds out there to contemplate the point.

In the mean time, can I have your ear for just a moment Elise? First, the words "we hold these truths to be self-evident" appear in the Declaration of Independence not the Constitution. Second, the complete phrase that was written by Thomas Jefferson and adopted by the rest of the founding fathers is "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 would be God.

Jefferson's point was plain, namely that a higher power endowed us humans with certain unalienable rights that should be honored as between us and our governments while we are here coexisting on this earth. There is no doubt about Jefferson's intent -- the "C" is capitalized in the original hand-written text of the Declaration (take a look at the picture on the web page of the National Archives), and by adding the part about the Creator Jefferson deliberately modified the concept of "natural" law that had been developed by John Locke in his Essay Concerning Human Understanding in 1690.

It was Locke's theory of natural rights (that Jefferson modified ever so slightly) that was independent of theology. Locke was a political philosopher not a theologian. But Locke did nonetheless believe in and advocate religious liberty and tolerance. It was Lockean Theory that gave origin to the First Clauses of the First Amendment to our Constitution which guarantee the Free Exercise of Religion.

Third, the commandment is "You shall not murder" -- the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Old testament) were not written in English, they were written and copied and re-copied over the centuries in Hebrew. The Hebrew word that was used is translated to mean murder in modern English.

And, yes, we still have this postulate reflected in modern American law.

The entire set of commandments were law at their time for that culture of people, but we have our own laws now in our modern American culture. And, Christians believe that they are called by God to honor their government and its laws (that's the Apostle Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Chapter 13

-- the New Testament). And, Christ taught that we should render to Caesar what is Caesars. But, Christians still get a voice in this Democracy about what the laws should be.

Finally, those who I have heard speak in opposition to the proposed sexual orientation ordinance have done so because it effectively shows no religious tolerance, and because it would have the effect of denying religious liberty (not to mention the fact that its provisions are so broad that they defy general societal norms of morality -- norms that are held by those who have no religious conviction whatsoever -- such as, men should not be allowed to use the women's bathroom or locker room just because they like to wear pantyhose and dresses).

Ask the father who has never stepped inside a church but who has daughters, if he thinks this law is well written.