



Straight Talk

by Muriel Sluyter

India, America and the Rule of Law

22 October, 2002

Greetings, Gentle Reader,

In India, Hindu fanatics have studied the acts, philosophies and strategy of Hitler and learned that a small minority can seize control of a country. Now they are implementing that strategy.

Having studied Hitler, they say they are not subject to the law making India a secular state. They declare Hindus are above the law.

They have established vast numbers of schools to teach children that non-Hindus have no rights. They declare both Islam and Christianity illegal, and are massacring followers of both religions.

Violence is not new to India, but the law remained above man, theoretically, rather than man being above the law. That is changing.

Let's examine this statement that they are above the law. It's worth studying, because the same thing is happening in America.

We don't have followers of one religion slaughtering those of other religions, but we have people declaring that they are above the law, as articulated by both legislatures and our Constitution.

Many, having adopted the religion of atheism, work tirelessly to deprive others of their Constitutional right to free exercise of religion. The recent outlawing of the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance is only the latest in a decades-long attack on religious freedom.

Two years ago, the Florida Supreme Court ruled that the law, as it was written by its legislature, was not to be applied in the presidential election. They declared, in essence, that they were above the law.

Now the New Jersey Supreme Court has done the same thing in a senatorial race.

At the same time, the Supreme Court of Hawaii admirably refused to follow their lead, although the temptation must have been exceptionally strong.

We, who have been a rule-of-law respecting country until recent decades, have raised a generation of Americans who are willing, even eager, to treat the laws

enacted by our elected representatives with contempt.

Why?

Many of our people no longer know or even care that our laws were based on the Ten Commandments. Others are eager to change our laws because they know they were based on God's laws, and having rejected God, defiantly reject his laws.

They think that since humans thought up these laws, another generation of humans can think up new laws that are more amenable to a society that has changed so dramatically from that developed by the framers of our original body of laws.

Many insist that we cannot legislate morality, but what do our laws against murder, rape, violence and theft do?

They legislate morality.

We say people have to support their own children.

Why?

Because it is morally reprehensible to force others to feed and clothe our offspring. So we have legislated morality and made it illegal for people to refuse to support their children.

In November, we are going to vote for people who will write laws, both state and federal.

Are we content to elect people who consider themselves above the law?

Or will we examine the past actions of those whom we elect, to see whether they respect the laws of our land?

In India, fascists say the will of the people (meaning Hindus) is above the rule of law.

In America, many judges legislate from the bench, saying their decisions are above the Constitution and the rule of law as it is written. There really is no difference.

Supreme Court justices are just "the people" in long, black dresses, no more, no less.

If we continue to treat our laws with contempt, both Germany's past and India's present point to what our future will be.