

eComment

R2018-053 and Motion to Appeal *Hunt v. KPB*



Greg Sutter

11/20/18 3:17 PM

Please do not file for an appeal on the court's decision about the Borough's invocation policy. The borough has already spent too much time, money and resources on this issue. If individual assembly members and their supporters wish to fund this measure with their private funds and reimburse the borough for monies already spent, then they should. Borough funds and resources should not be used for this matter. As demonstrated by this recent court decision and many others like it in our nation's history, separation of church and state is fundamental to our democracy. It is inappropriate to use public (government) funds and resources to promote one religious view over another.

Religion, or the lack thereof, is a private matter solely up to an individual. If an individual or a group of like-minded individuals desire to peacefully practice their beliefs, it is their right. But to impose their beliefs, implied or coerced, on others especially while conducting official government functions not only contradicts our constitution, it is not right.



Daniel Conetta

11/20/18 12:34 PM

I support Resolution 2018-053 as proposed. The cultural voice that an invocation brings to our assembly meetings is part of the fabric of our democracy and our local government and deserves a seat at the table. I am NOT in favor of a moment of silence. A moment of silence should be called out for what it really is -- it's a Moment of Censorship and no assembly member should ever be entertaining the thought of how muzzle the public. A moment of silence would limit how American citizens would be allowed to express themselves and would make it a crime if they did so otherwise. The right of the people to express wisdom and guidance for their assembly members via a prayer is upheld under the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.



Julia Person

11/20/18 12:05 PM

I support changing the invocation to be open to any resident of the Kenai Borough.



Greg Andersen

11/19/18 6:59 AM

I see this as a step in the correct direction and while I want to support this, I feel the need to remain neutral. A moment of silence is the only way that I see there not being issues in the future. It is simple and excludes no one. The Assembly needs to focus on doing borough business. This ongoing issue is a waste of tax payers hard earned money.

Greg Andersen
Kenai



Wayne Aderhold

11/16/18 9:44 PM

While I prefer the "moment of silence" option, I could live with this compromise (and appreciate Ms. Cooper's work, as well as the others showing a desire to honor both our State and US Constitutions. Those members who persist in trying to subvert the basic framework of our country and state by tyranny of their perceived majority need to recognize the errors of their ways and get back to our secular roots. At our founding, the churches were concerned that "government" might interfere with their freedom; now we have the converse situation.



Jessica Moore

11/14/18 8:56 AM

I propose that all who come to speak do so as private individuals, not as representatives of any organization or furthering a personal religious institution. Further I propose all residents who wish to give a spiritual (not religious) message be allowed to do so.

While I appreciate the current amendment, I am concerned with yet perceived religious tests ('approved organization', which 'meets regularly', for the 'purpose of sharing a religious perspective' and of which only 'leaders' are allowed to speak, ...although 'chaplains' themselves receive special wording??).

As a leader of the very large Peninsula Pagan Community, we are uninterested submitting to such criterion as we find them illegal and unethical. Further, pagans are largely irreligious, and this do not adhere to the definition of a "religious" association. I propose that the term "religious" be struck and replaced with "spiritual".

Regarding the wording of "No invocation should proselytize or advance any faith, or disparage the religious faith or non-religious views of others" (6/7) please understand that invocations which allude to a singular deity, an exclusively male deity, or a fatherly deity, or closing with "Amen" will be perceived as "advancing a faith". The singular male deity idea is exclusive to Abrahamic religions, promotes their ideas and agendas, and excludes the majority of the world's faith systems, including many in our area. Proselytizing the agenda of a religious institution should not be allowed.

PPC has proposed that all religious wording be removed from the assembly in cause and effect, and the 'religious invocation' be replaced with an all-inclusive 'evocation' (a solemnizing message devoid of reference to any religion, deity or collection of deities for the purpose of promoting spiritual upliftment) for the members of the assembly & our borough residents. The KPB could hold a meeting to craft such to be scripted and approved, thereby avoiding further legal recourse and borough cost. I've discussed at length with Mr Bagley this cogent idea.

Many members of the PPC intend to request to offer a nonfaith-based evocation as private residents, yet will not submit to religious tests, and do object to any religious inference found within spiritual messages brought before the assembly.

If the Assembly insists on including faith in it's secular government, the PPC does expect for it to do so equitably in a manner which is wholly inclusive to the spiritual systems of our area.