

I am writing to express opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 3020, which calls for North Dakota to acknowledge the Kingship of Jesus Christ. This resolution is not only a violation of the First Amendment, which prohibits government establishment of religion, but also an affront to Christ's own teachings and the very principle of religious freedom.

Which Jesus is this resolution proposing for kingship? What was his response when Christ was offered dominion over all earthly kingdoms? Matthew 4:8-10 recounts how the devil took Jesus to a high mountain and said, All this I will give you, if you will bow down and worship me. Jesus firmly rejected this offer, responding, Worship the Lord your God, and serve Him only. If Jesus refused earthly rule when offered all the kingdoms of the world, can we reasonably believe he is now interested in political authority over North Dakota?

Does this resolution reflect Christ's greatest commandment? Jesus did not command his followers to establish earthly theocracies. Instead, he told us to serve God with absolute single-heartedness (Deuteronomy 6:13) and to love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, and mind, followed by love your neighbor as yourself (Matthew 22:37-39).

Does this resolution demonstrate that love? Does it uplift the marginalized and the oppressed as Christ commanded? Or does it distort Christ's message into a political weapon? Are the sponsors of this resolution calling for the Messiah who teaches mercy, love, and service to others? Or the version of Jesus who hates the same people they hate?

This resolution is not an affirmation of faith; it is an assertion of Christian nationalism, contradicting both the teachings of Christ and the religious freedoms guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. It is a blatant misrepresentation of Jesus, a Jewish prophet who spoke of love, humility, and grace, not government-imposed faith.

Passing this resolution could have serious repercussions for marginalized communities in North Dakota. It risks fostering discrimination against non-Christians and non-religious people, creating social exclusion for those who do not align with its religious endorsement. By favoring one faith over others, the state would weaken religious freedom, fuel division, and set a dangerous precedent for further government intrusion into religious matters.

North Dakota does not need a government-mandated version of Christianity. Faith is meaningful because it is freely chosen, not politically imposed. Legislators should concern themselves with upholding the laws of North Dakota, not writing religious doctrine into public policy. For these reasons, I strongly urge the House Political Subdivisions Committee to issue a Do Not Pass recommendation on this resolution.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kevin R. Tengesdal  
Bismarck, District 35