

# Religious faith is guaranteed; all religious practice is not

*By treating anti-blasphemy initiatives and anti-western rejectionism as protected religious expression, Islamist enablers make a mockery of American values and freedoms.*

by Matthew Hausman



Secular progressives lack moral clarity when they preach détente with radical Islam while disparaging traditional Judaism and western religion. They mock assertive Jews as chauvinistic or conservative Christians as puritanical, but defend doctrinal supremacists who despise liberal democratic values.

Though the left often cites constitutional principles to justify coddling Islamists, the Constitution does not mandate tolerance of religious extremism. Nor does it guarantee totally unfettered freedom of religion. Freedom of belief is certainly absolute, but the exercise of religion is not when it compromises the rights of others. Moreover, government has a legitimate interest in monitoring extremist ideologies that threaten public health, safety, and welfare.

America's founding fathers envisioned a republic where individual liberties and communal obligations would be balanced in equipoise. Generations of immigrants were able to embrace the American ideal without abdicating their religious or cultural heritage because the Constitution requires no repudiation of background, imposes no national creed, and respects freedom of belief. It asks in return only that citizens pledge to uphold its principles. Immigrant Jews were able to thrive in this milieu because Jewish law provides "dina d'malchuta dina," or "the law of the land is the law." Accordingly, Jews always felt compelled to respect native laws, assuming that none prohibited observance of the commandments.

But supremacist ideologies that undermine the rights of others conflict with the law of the land, and thus are subject to monitoring and – if necessary – restriction...

CONTINUE

READING

AT <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/233>

[54](#)