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Is belief in God required to hold office in America?

by Jake MacAulay

C.O.O. of the Institute on the Constitution

*There are seven states including Maryland with language in their constitutions that prohibits people who do not believe in God from holding public office.*

Jake, as someone who claims to be versed in constitutional law, you of all people, should know that those 7 laws have been declared unconstitutional. They are unenforceable. Christians have tried and failed to enforce them.

Why do you hide this easily researchable fact from your audience? Is it because you know that the people who follow you are so mentally lazy that they would never exert the effort to research it for themselves?

Yes - I think that is pretty much what you are counting on.

*And now, according to a recent New York Times article by Laurie Goodstein, a coalition of nonbelievers including atheists, agnostics, humanists and freethinkers, led and primarily funded by atheist Todd Steifel, says it is time to get rid of these atheist bans because they are discriminatory, offensive and unconstitutional.*

Well Jake, I don't really care whether they do or not. In fact, leaving them on the books for future generations to see, is a great way to show them what America was like when Ghost Worshipers were fighting to take control of our Democracy. It's kind of like leaving biblically-approved slavery laws on the books: they aren't legal, but they let us know what human pieces of shit actually smelled like.

*Besides Maryland, the other six states with language in their constitutions that prohibit people who do not believe in God from holding public office are Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.*

Jake, what a lineup. If you wanted to pick the worst states in the Union for crime, lack of education, misogyny, racism, and poverty, you couldn't have chosen a finer group of human scum than those Confederate states who tried to steal half of America so they could keep human slaves.

*Mississippi’s Constitution, for example, says, “No person who denies the existence of a Supreme Being shall hold office in this state.*

Jake, here's a link I think you'll get a kick out of:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thank_God_for_Mississippi>

*Mr. Steifel’s coalition, which is known by the name “Openly Secular”, claims that these constitutional requirements are a form of bigotry against those who deny God’s existence.*

Jake, that may have been true at one time. However, now they are just an embarrassment for Christians which is why I am in favor of leaving them on the books.

*But before we jump on the bigotry bandwagon, let’s think about this a little more carefully.*

Jake, it's too bad you never considered doing that before accepting the fairy tales in your holy book.

*Our American system of law and justice is predicated upon the belief that individuals have rights and that the purpose of civil government is to protect and to secure these rights. Foundational to this system of law, liberty and justice is the belief that these rights come from God.*

Jake, the millions of Christians who invaded the Americas, murdered millions of natives, stole all their land, and then imported human slaves, may have believed that their rights came from an invisible ghost ... but that doesn't mean that they did.

*This “American View” of law and government is found in the Declaration of Independence and it is contained in each and every Constitution of each and every state.*

Jake, the Declaration is just that ... a declaration. It is not law. State constitutions, as you well know, are subordinate to Federal Law and to the U.S. Constitution.

There ... all fixed. Please continue.

*Now, let’s be clear. Mr. Steifel may not believe that there is a God. And no one is forcing him to do so. But if he doesn’t believe that God exists, it follows that he doesn’t believe that God-given rights exist either.*

Jake, as surprised as I am to admit this ... your logic is spot on.

*And if he doesn’t believe that God-given rights exist, then how would you expect him, if elected, to defend and protect those rights?*

Jake, I wouldn't. There would be no need for Todd to defend and protect imaginary rights. But I would expect him to defend and protect the rights granted to all Americans under the U.S. Constitution.

*You see, when someone is elected to office he swears an oath to protect and defend the Constitution and the God-given rights that are secured thereby.*

Jake, which "God-given rights" are you referring to?

The first and foremost of God's commandments is "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." Yet our first and foremost Amendment allows just the opposite ... freedom of religion.

Our Founding Fathers slapped your God across His invisible face when they passed that Amendment.

So when someone is elected to public office, that person swears an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, and the rights that were granted by "We the people" - not by "I AM" (Exodus 3:14).

*To elect someone who does not believe that God exists, is to ask them to do that which is impossible for them to do.*

Jake, that would be true if your misunderstanding were true. But since it wasn't ... it isn't.

*The drafters of our state constitutions understood this simple logic and so they included these provisions designed to protect us from officeholders who do not share the American philosophy of law and government.*

Jake, that wasn't true outside the Confederacy. The only constitutions on your side are the ones written by slaveowners. Fortunately, their crap is now invalid ... as is yours.

*Think of it this way. Suppose instead of not believing in God, Mr. Steifel informs us that he does not believe that there exists a city called Cincinnati, Ohio. By not believing in Cincinnati, Mr. Steifel breaks no law that we can punish him for. But now suppose that a few of us have decided to take a bus trip to visit Cincinnati. We advertise for a driver and Mr. Stiefel answers our advertisement. Is Mr. Steifel qualified to drive us to Cincinnati?*

Jake, no he isn't, but not for the reason you think. If Todd doesn't believe that the city of Cincinnati exists, and yet he applies to drive to a place he believes is imaginary ... then he would obviously not be mentally qualified to be put in a position where other people's lives are in his hands.

In other words, Jake, if Todd were to do what you proposed, he should be getting professional mental help.

*Do you see the problem?*

Jake, as I just pointed out, I see a huge problem with your attempt at logic. You just gave everyone a great example of what religion does to the brain.

*Once he started the bus, what would Mr. Steifel do next? How would he get us to a place the existence of which he denies?*

Jake, you said he doesn't believe it exists. If he were mentally ill enough to take that job anyway, then the first thing he would have to do, would be to get directions from someone who did believe that Cincinnati was a real place. He would then follow those directions and eventually, either Todd or the passenger would be proven wrong.

Jake, a 5th-grader could have figured that one out. Don't you have anyone who can proofread this crap for you and save you the humiliation of blasting your ignorance all over the web?

(well, I guess I just answered my own question, didn't I?)

*Of course he is not qualified. He not only doesn’t know the way. He doesn’t even believe that there is a way. He is not qualified to take us to a place that, in his own mind, does not exist.*

Jake, go back and read my previous explanation. The only qualification he needs is to be a competent driver. Whether or not he believes the destination exists will not affect the outcome.

*So this constitutional requirement that an office holder must believe in God is a logical and consistent protection against those who might drive our constitutional republic in a bad direction.*

Jake, your argument is based on a false analogy. That is a logical fallacy which invalidates your argument. Go back to the drawing board, try again, and this time, see if you can find a 5th-grader to read it for you first, before posting it on the web for everyone to laugh at.

*This isn’t about discrimination or bigotry.*

Jake, if you are denying someone their "God-given" rights to participate in the activities of government because they don't share your religious delusions ... how do you figure that isn't discrimination or bigotry?

Actually, it is both.

*It’s about ensuring that those holding office in America are committed to the true, lawful, American philosophy of government.*

Jake, the true, lawful, American philosophy of government is based on the principles of Solon of Athens ... not Jesus Christ.

Jake, Stoicism was outlawed by Roman Emperor Justinian because its values contradicted Christian doctrine. You want to know what those values were Jake?

1. Liberty

2. Human rights

3. Equality under the law

4. Freedom of speech

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stoicism>

Look familiar Jake?

Those are the same values that Americans hold dear; and they are the same values that contradicted Christian doctrine.

Christine doctrine, meaning the Bible, hasn't changed Jake ...

only Christian lies.

<http://www.theamericanview.com/is-belief-in-god-required-to-hold-office-in-america/>
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THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

Mayo Clinic researchers identify first steps

in the formation of pancreatic cancer

Scientists described the molecular steps necessary for acinar cells (which release digestive enzymes) in the pancreas to become precancerous lesions. Some of these lesions can then morph into cancer. Pancreatic cancer develops from these lesions, so if researchers can understand how these lesions come about, they may be able to stop the cancer altogether.

The need for new treatment and prevention strategies is pressing. Pancreatic cancer is one of the most aggressive human cancers because symptoms do not occur until the cancer is well advanced. One-year survival after diagnosis is only 20 percent. It is the fourth leading cause of cancer death in America.

Scientists studied pancreatic cells with Kras genetic mutations. Kras produces a protein that regulates cell division, and the gene is often mutated in many cancers. More than 95 percent of pancreatic cancer cases have a Kras mutation.

The researchers detailed the steps that led acinar cells with Kras mutations to transform into duct-like cells with stem cell-like properties. Stem cells, which can divide at will, are also often implicated in cancer.

They found that Kras proteins in the acinar cells induce the expression of a molecule, ICAM-1, which attracts macrophages, a specific kind of immune cell. These inflammatory macrophages release a variety of proteins, including some that loosen the structure of the cells, allowing acinar cells to morph into different types of cells. These steps produced the precancerous pancreatic lesions.

Scientists showed a direct link between Kras mutations and the inflammatory environment that drive the initiation of pancreatic cancer.

But the process can be halted in laboratory mice. This could be done in two ways -- by depleting the macrophages or by treating the transformed cells with a blocking antibody that shuts down ICAM-1. Doing either one reduced the number of precancerous lesions.

Researchers said that a neutralizing antibody that blocks ICAM-1 has already been developed. It is being tested for a wide variety of disorders, including stroke and rheumatoid arthritis.

Understanding the crosstalk between acinar cells with Kras mutations and the microenvironment of those cells is key to developing targeted strategies to prevent and treat pancreatic cancer.

(by the way Jake, you referred to Stiefel 8 times in that essay, and to your credit, you actually spelled his name right ... once)
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FAMOUS QUOTES

Ronald Reagan, Conservative Icon

(no biography - previously quoted)

“We establish no religion in this country.

We command no worship.

We mandate no belief, nor will we ever.

Church and state are and must remain separate.”