

## Re: OT: Opinions, not flames please

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.transcription/2006-12/msg00158.html>

---

- *From:* RaeMorrill <RaeMorrill@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 29 Nov 2006 02:11:35 GMT
- 

I'm really stunned by this line of thought at all. Books like Mein Kampf are not "holy scripture" to anyone far as I know. Mormons believe in the Bible. The Book of Mormon is "another testament of Jesus Christ." (Lizzie or Julie may feel free to jump in if that is in accurate).

Many people who are "Jews" are not religious Jews, i.e., they are Jews by nationality/race, not by faith. Even if they are, the OT is still par of their holy tradition. To me swearing on the Bible is "iffy" at best – considering what it teaches. However, to take an oath on something you consider nothing more than fiction would be the highest sacrilege to a believer – I would think.

Marsha wrote:

jmornngstar@xxxxxxx wrote:

Marsha wrote:

I was a little taken aback with it, but a reasonable

solution, IMO, would be to have him take the oath on both the Bible and the Koran.

Marsha/Ohio

What good would it do to have him take the oath on a book that he doesn't believe in? You might as well have him take it with his hand on a comic book. Why do you find it unacceptable for him to take it on the Koran? If he swears to the Koran he is likely going to be held to a more higher standard in his own mind and own community than if the pinkies are on a bible.

Re: OT: Opinions, not flames please

I didn't say it was unacceptable. A lot of people who don't believe in the Bible have served in office. This paragraph is interesting:

"For all of American history, Jews elected to public office have taken their oath on the Bible, even though they do not believe in the New Testament, and the many secular elected officials have not believed in the Old Testament either. Yet those secular officials did not demand to take their oaths of office on, say, the collected works of Voltaire or on a volume of New York Times editorials. Nor has one Mormon official demanded to put his hand on the Book of Mormon. And it is hard to imagine a scientologist being allowed to take his oath of office on a copy of "Dianetics" by L. Ron Hubbard. Devotees of multiculturalism and political correctness who do not see how damaging to the fabric of American civilization it is to allow Ellison to choose his own book need only imagine a racist elected to Congress. Would they allow him to choose Hitler's "Mein Kampf," the Nazis' bible, for his oath? And if not, why not? On what grounds will those defending Ellison's right to choose his favorite book deny that same right to a racist who is elected to public office?"

Have we not had any athiests or agnostics elected? I can't believe they would have sworn on a bible. You don't have to swear on a bible in court.

Janice

I could be wrong, but I thought all those elected to office had to swear on a Bible. This has been quite enlightening, as I've never thought about it before.

Marsha/Ohio