

Craig, Sondra

From: Nathanael Eisner, AFC. <ambassadorherald@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 9, 2022 10:18 AM
To: ZZ City Clerk External
Subject: Vote No to #Sec. 32-191

*** **CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ***

Dear City Council Members,

It is obvious why #22-0636 has come about this month. It is because of the so-called "pride month". However, that makes it even easier to find testimonies by those who have come out, who are also speaking out this month. Have any of you on this Council ever listened to that anecdotal evidence?

Sure, there are people who have taken the wrong course in how to help a person and those who have taken their help in the wrong way, and harm has come. Those cases have also been documented, as all of the individual "persons", by your own definition, have stated. **By your definition, you only list 10 "persons" under (a) (3).**

I do want to make that perfectly clear, under "Intent and Purpose" points three and four, by your definition of what a "person" is, these are all individual "persons". However, they are recorded as if they are more than "individual persons", which is self-contradiction within the very proposed "Ordinance".

I also find it to be a contradiction in that the proposed "Ordinance" is to "protect" the individual from being converted and yet it is advocating for the ability of others to change their body or mental state into that which was not there before. A biological male, for example, is being told that they are being "protected" by making them not a male. Under a definition of the word "converted", that is a conversion, too.

Furthermore, the freedom of speech and the freedom to parent as one sees best for your kids is protected by our Constitution. Absolutely, there are criminal acts parents can commit against their children and these must be taken care of, as per the Constitution.

The evidence must be shown that Conversion Therapy really does not work, and it has to be more than just the opinion of 10 defined "persons". Just because there are some negative outcomes does not make the whole a negative practice. Use that same logic on chemotherapy and you will find out that Conversion Therapy is not at all a negative thing, because chemo always--100%--has negative impact. Conversion Therapy has a lot of success stories, and people who are happy that it was done on them. Why don't you go listen to some of that anecdotal evidence from those actual people?

Besides, passing a law against the Constitution is in the Constitution itself as illegal and no one can be sent to jail, or fined, or take any legal action against their legal right as a person with free speech. This has been ruled in court numerous times in the past as well, free speech can not be infringed upon or it is not a law.

You guys need to also consider the fact that sooner or later, if you continue going against the Constitution, someone is going to make "a law" against the Constitution that is going to affect you, and you will wish that you had spoken up sooner against such a practice.

So, I say vote "No" to #Sec. 32-191. Your conscience should agree, since you do not want anyone to infringe upon your conscience either, do you? Jesus never forces His way on people, but He is always knocking. That is the way the United States of America was designed to be. Follow Jesus, obey the Constitution, listen to your conscience.

Sincerely,
Nathanael Eisner, AFC.

Isaiah 33:22 (KJV), "For The LORD [Yahweh] is our Judge [Judicial Branch], The LORD is our Lawgiver [Statutemaker; Congressional Branch], The LORD is our King [Presidential Branch]; He will save us."