

 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**
**INAPPROPRIATE
EQUIVALENCY!**
**(How did this sort of
thinking develop?)**

By Stephen L. Bakke  June 6, 2015



Here's what provoked me:

An incredibly goofy letter appeared in which the writer equated picturing Christ in an "immoral act" with picturing Mohammed "inappropriately"! Her incredible theme is obvious: She equates "pictured in immoral acts" (use your imagination folks!) with "pictured inappropriately." Does she realize that for Mohammed, "pictured inappropriately" means "any sort of picture or representation"?

Here's my response:

Inappropriate Equivalency! (How did this sort of thinking develop?)

Sharon Davies writes about "Let's be civil" on June 4. Her message seems to be that the frequent negative reactions to radical Islam is a symptom of being "so narrow-minded that we can't respect opinions that don't agree with ours." She sees herself as a good example for others and states: "If I don't know what a person's religious beliefs are I use "Happy Holidays."

While she will tolerate use of the term "Islamic terrorist," she insists that it be used only alongside use of the term "Christian terrorist." She wonders "what would happen if Christ was pictured engaged in "immoral" acts. Would we react the same way as Muslims when the Prophet Mohammed is pictured inappropriately?"

Her incredible theme is obvious: She equates "pictured in immoral acts" (use your imagination folks!) with "pictured inappropriately." Does she realize that for Mohammed, "pictured inappropriately" means "any sort of picture or representation"? The absurdness of that equivalency needs no explanation! How did that sort of thinking develop?

She declares: "I think I am going to ignore opinion letters in 2016 – I don't know if I can handle it." To which I must suggest why wait until 2016 to end your misery?