The Elephant in the Room Isn’t Trump

(February 4, 2020)

Welcome to 2020. Here we are providing clear vision into a new decade. Man is that corny. Anyway, you're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek, here on the American Family Radio Network, and it's time to go back and review some of the emails I got to the show I did about four weeks ago called Why Evangelicals Voted for Trump. I wanted enough people to respond to that so we could have an interesting conversation regarding that. And, for those of you that didn't listen to that podcast, it goes back to, I think, December 7, a day that will live in infamy. And I gave four reasons why I thought most evangelicals, or at least a majority of evangelicals, voted for Trump. And this was all prompted by an article in Rolling Stone that I happen to be in because of a meeting that I was a part of in the Trump Tower prior to the election. Now, I don't have time to go through, obviously, that entire show again, but I thought that there were five major reasons why evangelicals voted for Trump. Number one, there was no other good alternative. Number two people voted for a president, not a pastor. Number three, policy Trump's demeanor. Number four judges, judges, judges. And number five, Trump fights important battles that other conservatives won't.

Okay, so those were the five reasons I thought that most evangelicals, 81% or so, voted for Trump. And as I said, this was not an endorsement of Trump or anything. It was just simply saying, here's why I think evangelicals voted for Trump. Now since then, as you know, Christianity Today has come out with an editorial saying that Trump ought to be removed from office. We'll talk about that a little bit. But I more want to concentrate on some of the responses that I got. Most of the people voted...most people emailed me and said, they agreed those are the five reasons and they agreed that's why they voted for Trump. But there were a couple of people, in particular, that had long responses. And they didn't really disagree that these were the five reasons evangelicals voted for Trump. They seem to agree those were the reasons. But the folks that wrote, the two folks in particular that wrote, said that they couldn't vote for Trump, and they seem to be saying that no Christian should vote for Trump. So, I want to give them some airtime here and deal with what they've said.
And before we get into that, I just want to ask a few questions that I think will set the table for this discussion. The first question is, what is the purpose of government? Why do we have a government at all? That's the first question. Number two, what is your primary reason for choosing a president? And then number three, who of the available candidates will best fulfill the primary reason you're voting for a president? So, you're looking at the purpose of government. The purpose essentially of a president, why would you choose such a person? What do you want that person to do? And then who of the available candidates will best do that? Nobody's going to do it perfectly. We know that. But of the available candidates that you have, who is going to fulfill that purpose?

Now, we talked about this before, but the basic purpose of government is to protect innocent people from evil. Paul talks about this in Romans 13. Protect innocent people from evil. Just yesterday, or the day before, we had a missile attack in Iran, or in Iraq actually, on one of the Iranian leaders. Apparently, according to the Associated Press, this guy was like the number two most powerful person in the Iranian government. And he had, as everybody is admitting, fostered or provoked, or actually led attacks against Americans abroad. And so, apparently, President Trump said...and one of the things he led, or one of the incidents he was behind, was the rating of the embassy there in Baghdad just a few days ago. And President Trump apparently thought, well, this guy has made himself a target and we're going to take him out in the interest of protecting innocent people from evil. Paul says the government, or the leader, doesn't bear the sword for nothing. In a fallen world, with fallen people, sometimes force is going to be necessary. And there are times when that is necessary to protect innocent people from evil.

So that's the main reason we have a government. To protect innocent people from evil. As James Madison famously said, if men were angels, no government would be necessary. That's the reason we have governments. Anarchy is not a good solution,' or a good alternative to government. And I've asked this question of you guys before. Just a thought experiment. If the police were to say that tomorrow, for 24 hours, there will be no prosecution of any crime. You can do whatever you want, and you will never be prosecuted for it. Would the Lexus dealer survive? Would Best Buy survive? Would you survive? Somebody had a grudge against you and wanted to kill you and get you out of their way, they could do so in that 24 hours. How many people would be murdered, raped, killed? How many homes would be burglarized? How many
dealerships would be vandalized? I mean, it would be chaos. So, we need government. That's the purpose of government.

Now, why do we choose a president? Well, primarily to fulfill those duties. To execute the laws duly passed. He's the executive. He is the executive of the nation, so he is supposed to have an administration that executes the laws that have been passed by Congress and signed by the president. Or if they've been passed by Congress and vetoed by the President, and Congress has overwritten them, he's still obligated to execute those laws. That's why we have a president.

Now, let's go to Jesus here for a minute before we look at the emails. Jesus, in Matthew chapter 23, is talking to Pharisees, and of course there are other people listening as well. But the Pharisees were the political leaders of Israel. In addition to being religious leaders, some of them were members of the Sanhedrin. The Sanhedrin was the Jewish ruling council that, as you know, sentenced Jesus to die. They were sort of like the Jewish Supreme Court. And Rome delegated much of the lawmaking authority to the Sanhedrin. So, these are politicians, and Jesus goes after these people. And what does he say to them? Here's Matthew 23:23. Easy to remember. Matthew 23:23. And this is in the middle of a long scolding of these religious politicians. He says, whoa to you teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites. You give a 10th of your spices, mint, dill, and cumin, but you've neglected the more important matters of the law; justice, mercy, and faithfulness. You should have practiced the latter without neglecting the former, you blind guides. You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel. What's Jesus' rebuke to these politicians? He's saying, you're majoring in the minors. You're tithing your spices, but you're neglecting the weightier matters of the law. The more important matters of the law.

What's the implication here? Some issues are more important than other issues. Some laws are more important than other laws. Yes, you can be guilty of breaking the entire law in Jewish theology by breaking one law, but that doesn't mean that all the laws are equal. And Paul, or Jesus even implies that when he's asked, what's the greatest commandment? He's implying a hierarchy. Well, the greatest commandment is to love God and then love one another. That's the second greatest commandment. Okay, so there's a hierarchy. Some things are more important than others. So, if he's scolding the politicians of Israel for neglecting the weightier matters of the law, the more important matters, then when we are faced with a choice of
politicians, we have to ensure that we are not neglecting the more important matters of the law. And so, when you look at the choices you have, whenever you're about to vote, you should be voting on what's the more important matters of the law. Yes, there are other issues that are important as well, but what is the most important, or what are the most important issues you want to be voting on? And so, this will help guide our discussion as I respond to a couple of people who disagreed with what I had said in the last podcast, or the show that I did four weeks ago called Why Evangelicals Voted for Trump. So, after the break, we'll get to that.

Before we do, I want to mention that Bobby Conway is going to be teaching Doubting Toward Faith, the online course. It begins next week. You might as well start fresh this year. If you've had doubts, here's your chance to get rid of them. Go to crossexamined.org. Click on online Christian courses. You'll see it there. Back in just two minutes. Don't go away.

Welcome to 2020. A new decade. My wife and I were just talking the other day that, think about this. I'm 58 years old now. This is my seventh decade. I'm starting my seventh decade. Man, that sounds old. My dad, who's 83, is in his 10th decade. Think about that. He's been in the 30s, the 40s, the 50s, the 60s, the 70s, the 80s, the 90s, the 2000s the 2010s. Now 2020 and past. That's 10 decades. And I'm entering my seventh. Man, I sound old. Well, I guess I am.

Well, anyway, we've got limited time to make disciples of all nations. So, that's what we're trying to do here at I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. We're talking about some email responses I got to the program regarding, Why Evangelicals Voted for Trump. You can go back and listen to that podcast on our iTunes, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast. And thank you so much for putting positive reviews up there. It helps move it up the charts and more people can hear the podcast. But, obviously, I can't go back and cover everything we covered there. I just want to read excerpts from long responses that some Christian writers wrote in.

One of these is from a gentleman by name of Austin. And I won't give last names, because this person is not here to interact. There's no reason to do that. But he supports what we do here at the ministry. But he says, "Dr. Turek, more important than whether Trump is the standard [bearer of] Christianity, is whether he is [viewed] as a standard bearer for Christianity. I believe he is, sadly by millions. Having just finished a Bachelor's in a public university, which is
increasingly progressive, in the field of psychology, which is progressive to a laughable extent, I know personally, countless examples of individuals who view him this way."

Okay. Let me stop right here and point out that, just because people who are not Christians misunderstand something about Christianity, doesn't mean that you're then therefore obligated to not do what you think is right, according to Christianity. So, just because people may misunderstand and think Trump is your standard bearer for Christianity, doesn't mean that if you think Trump is the better choice than say, Hillary, you shouldn't vote for Trump. Okay. Now, again, this is not a show to endorse Trump or any of that. I'm just thinking through these issues with you. And yeah, there may be people that erroneously think that Trump is the standard bearer, because a lot of Christians voted for Trump. But I'm gonna get into the reasons why that's not the case here in just a minute. But that's no reason for you to then say, well, gee, I guess I can't vote for Trump then, because people outside of Christianity misunderstand the fact that I voted for Trump. I mean, if you had voted for Hillary, would they think Hillary was the standard bearer for Christianity. No. They'd never say that.

So, anyway, let me continue with what this gentleman says. He says, "there's a lack of condemnation from outspoken Christian politicians, and public pastors, of Trump's appalling behavior." Let me agree with you. I think, as I've said before, I think that there are too many cheerleaders out there who claim to be Christians who won't say any negative, corrective thing about the President. And I've said many things that I think Trump does wrong. His rude behavior. I agree with you. Okay? We ought to call all politicians out when they do something that we think is immoral. So, I don't disagree with you there. But again, that's not the biggest issue. That's not the most important issue at this point.

Austin goes on to say that Trump's status as POTUS, President of the United States, he's viewed as a standard bearer, and that is deeply problematic. He may not be worshiped widely, but he is championed widely by evangelicals. Okay, now this is me responding. Okay, he's championed widely by evangelicals. Is he champion for being a Christian, or for being a president? That's my question. I don't think many Christians are championing Donald Trump for being a Christian. But they are saying, we like the policies he's promoting as president. He says, "I agree"...this is back to Austin again..."so, while the terms worship and the standard bearer or hyperbolic, I agree with their intended meaning that he is unavoidably, actually entirely avoidable, had
Christians voted their Jesus rather than their frustrations, a standard bear. I would urge you to consider how Donald Trump's brashness, and now inextricable connection with Christianity could, and has, hurt our ability to witness to certain people. That I feel is worthy of discussion."

Okay. That's Austin. Let me agree with you. I agree. It's worthy of discussion. That's why I'm reading your comment on the air, Austin. Christians, as I just said, Christian leaders should correct the president and not make excuses for his rude behavior. I personally have on this program. Now, this show is not a show that's centered on politics. We do talk about politics sometimes, because it is an aspect of our Christian obligation, an aspect of reality that Christianity impacts, just like it impacts other aspects of reality. But this is not a show where I talk about Trump every week. In fact, we talk about politics maybe 20% of the time. 80% of the time we're talking about other issues; apologetics, theology, philosophy, those kinds of things. Okay? But I do talk about it. I will say this, though. I know there are people on his council, his Evangelical Advisory Council. And according to them, they do correct him privately. Now you're saying maybe they ought to come out publicly. Well, you know how politics works. And, by the way, this is this is even true in business. You correct privately and you applaud publicly. Otherwise, people are going to get their feathers ruffled.

Now, you might say, well, I want to make an argument that Christians ought to publicly rebuke the president. Well, maybe some do. I know some have been a part of that Evangelical Council and maybe have left because of that. That's a judgment call on their part. I don't see many Christian leaders excusing Trump's rude behavior. They may not talk about it very much, but they don't excuse it when asked. Okay? But I agree with you that they ought to talk more about it if they're given the opportunity.

Now, let me say this. When a Christian chooses Donald Trump for president over Hillary Clinton, or any of the current democratic candidates, because actually, they've all gone further left than Hillary Clinton since 2016. When a Christian chooses Trump over those people for president, the Christian is not saying that Trump is my standard bearer for Christianity. Just because the media insist that's the truth, doesn't mean it is. Jesus is the standard bearer for all Christians. Christianity doesn't exist for politics. It's not a political party. Christianity exists because God exists. And we are sinners and Jesus came to rescue us by giving us the gift of himself. But he gives that to us by grace. Christianity is all about grace when it comes to personal salvation.
Now, that does have implications on politics, obviously, and that's what we're talking about here today. Christianity has implications on politics, as it does all aspects of life. But as I pointed out on this show four weeks ago, Christianity does not have a politician, or any other mortal, as its standard bearer. Jesus is our standard bear. Even if the media tries to claim, oh no, he's your standard bearer. No, he's not. He's he may be our president, but he's not our standard bearer for Christian behavior.

Choosing Trump for president doesn't make Trump a standard bearer for Christianity any more than choosing Hillary for president makes her a standard bearer for Christianity. Choosing Trump for president doesn't make Trump a standard bearer for Christianity any more than choosing an Amazon product makes Jeff Bezos a standard for Christianity. When you're choosing a president, among the limited options you have, you're not choosing a missionary. You're not choosing a Bible teacher. You're not choosing a pastor. You're not choosing a pope. You're choosing a president whose main job is to advocate for policies that protect innocent people from evil, and to promote the common good. That's the purpose of government. That's why we started out with those questions. What is the purpose of government? And why would you choose a president? What is the main reason you're choosing a president? Again, the primary reason you select the president is for his policies, not his personality. His policies, not his demeanor.

Now, as I've mentioned before, I personally give Trump an A minus on policy and a D on demeanor. His democratic opponents, with their anti-life, anti-marriage, anti-religious freedom, anti-national security, open borders policies, and, of course, their anti-prosperity socialist agenda, which hasn't worked anywhere in the world, because it misunderstands human nature. With all of those policies they support, in my view, they get an F on policy. So, it doesn't matter how good their demeanor is. You can have great demeanor but if the primary reason you're putting a president into office is for policy reasons, then the demeanor doesn't overwhelm that.

Now, I've also said this many times. That I want a president to be good on policy and good on demeanor. And I think Trump's demeanor contributes to the coarseness of our culture. And Christian leaders, again, should correct him on that. But if I can only have one. If it's a choice between policy, and a choice between demeanor, policy Trump's demeanor. You choose a president primarily for his policies. That's his constitutionally ordained role. He's going to
implement policies, and support policy, support and implement, and that's why you put him in there.

It goes back to what I mentioned on the program four weeks ago. When you choose a surgeon, why are you primarily choosing a surgeon? You’re choosing a surgeon because of the surgery he does. Now, if you have a surgeon who has a great demeanor, but he's not really a good surgeon, are you going to choose him over a surgeon that is a great surgeon, but has a bad demeanor? A bad bedside manner. No. You’re obviously going to go with the good surgeon. You hope your surgeon has both, but if he doesn’t, you’re there for the surgery. Not because he pats your hand before he cuts you open. So again, don't get me wrong. I wish we had both in one guy. At this point we don't. We don't have both. This goes back to Jesus' saying where he says, you've neglected the more important matters of the law. If you're going to vote for a guy based on his personality, rather than his policies, you're neglecting the more important matters of the law.

Do you know you have people in this country telling us what light bulbs we should and shouldn't use, but they won't tell us, don't kill our children, either inside the womb or even now, as soon as the baby is born outside the womb? These people are neglecting the more important matters of the law. When they tell us what light bulbs to use, but they're allowing us to kill our children. And they're even using government funds to kill our children. Now this even came out in the...gee, sorry, just getting tired here. It comes out in the Christianity Today editorial. If you haven't read it, you should go read it. It's very well written, by Mark Galli. He's the editor over there now, there's been a big controversy over this whole thing. I will say it's well written I will say it was a bold move. I don't agree with it, but he gave his opinion. Okay, I can respect that. And here's what he says right in the middle of this Christianity Today article. He says Can we say with a straight face that abortion is a great evil that cannot be tolerated, and with the same straight face say that the bed broken character of our nation's leader doesn't really matter in the end? Well, I'm going to respond to that right after the break you're listening to I don't have enough faith to be an atheist with Frank Turk right here in the American family Radio Network, or website cross examined.org. Our app two words in the App Store, cross examine our YouTube channel cross examined, sign up for it back into Alright, let me go back to what Christianity Today said in the middle of their editorial, you can read the entire editorial and you should, as I say, it's well written.
It's Christianity today. Just search for just google Christianity Today, Trump you'll find it anyway. Mark galley, the editor there says, can we say with a straight face that abortion is a great evil that cannot be tolerated and with the same straight face say that the bent and broken character of our nation's leader doesn't really matter in the end, unquote. Okay, here's my response. No one that I know about who's a Christian is saying the character doesn't matter. And no one who's a Christian is saying Trump is a choir boy. No one's saying that. The question is, what do you mean by character? Do you mean his demeanor or his record of following through on his policy promises? Trump's demeanor is a problem. We've already been through that. But he is following through on his policy promises and that is more important when it comes to why you put somebody in the presidency.

So yes, let me say with a straight face to CT, that saving babies is more important than demeanor. Again, I'd like to save babies and be nice, but if I could only have one or the other, give me the saved babies. And this was put beautifully by Dennis Prager. For those of you who don't know, Dennis Prager, he's a brilliant conservative Jewish radio host who has put together Trump... Trump duh... I got Trump on the mind. Why? We're talking about Trump. Prager University. Five minute really succinct videos. If you haven't availed yourself of Prager University, just go to YouTube. Look up Prager University. You'll see all these great little videos that explains so many issues in a very succinct and colorful way. And he also has a number of columns. Dennis writes a column very frequently, and he wrote a column just a couple of weeks ago. Let me get the exact title of this. Oh, it's a response to the editor of Christianity Today. And you can Google that and find that. In any event, here is just an excerpt of it. I can't read the whole thing. Don't have time. Anyways. Anyways, Prager says, the gist of the Christianity Today editorial, and of most religious and conservative opposition to President Trump is that any good the president has done is dwarfed by his character defects. This is an amoral view that says more about Galli than it does about the president. He, and the people who share his opinion, are making the following statement. No matter how much good this president does, it is less important than his character flaws. Why is this wrong? First, because it devalues the policies that benefit millions of people. And second, because it is a simplistic view of character.

Now, I don't have enough time to go into the entire column I say here, but I'm just going to quote some excerpts from this column. And he's dealing with the benefits here, Dennis is, to
the millions of people. He says, "to us," meaning the people that are with him in supporting President Trump as president. He says, "to us, putting pressure on the Iranian regime," and by the way, he just did this two days ago with the missile attack... "putting pressure on the Iranian regime, one of the most evil and dangerous regimes on earth, by getting out of the Iran nuclear deal made by former President Barack Obama, is a moral issue." Even the New York Times columnist, Brett Stevens, who loathes Trump, has written how important the president's rejection of the Obama Iran agreement has been.

Number two. "To us, enabling millions of black Americans to find work, resulting in the lowest black unemployment rate ever recorded, is a moral issue. To us, more Americans than ever been employed, and almost 4 million Americans freed from reliance on food stamps, is a moral issue. To us, appointing more conservative justices, or judges than any president in history over the same period of time, is a moral issue. That whether the courts, including the Supreme Court, are dominated by the left or by conservatives, is dismissed by Galli as political poker, makes one question, not only Galli's, moral thinking, but his moral theology. To us, moving the American Embassy to Israel's capital, Jerusalem, something promised by almost every presidential candidate, is a moral issue. Not to mention profoundly courageous encourages a moral virtue. To us, increasing the US military budget, after severe cuts of the previous eight years, is a moral issue. As conservative see it, the American military is the world's greatest guarantor of world peace." And Dennis Prager goes on. So, he's pointing out the weightier matters of the law. And it's ironic that Dennis, being a Jewish man, is basically giving an argument that Jesus would give over the editor of Christianity Today.

Now, all right. There's more to Austin's email, but we don't have time to get into it. I want to get to another email. And before I do, I want to remind you that if you have doubts about Christianity, then Bobby Conway, who has written, Doubting Toward Faith, and is the leader of the One Minute Apologist, is starting a new course this week called, Doubting Toward Faith. You can take it anytime you want, if you just take the basic course. But if you want to be live on zoom video, asking questions of Bobby directly, Dr. Bobby Conway, you need to sign up for the premium version. And you can sign up anytime during this coming week. But sign up soon for, Doubting Toward Faith. He'll tell you, not just the intellectual reasons why you ought not doubt, but also help you through the emotional reasons you may be doubting. And then a couple of weeks after that, we have the Textual Criticism course with Dr. Dan Wallace from Dallas.
Theological Seminary, one of the top manuscript scholars in the world. And again, you can be live on zoom video asking him questions. The biblical criticism or Textual Criticism course is available. Both those courses are available if you go to crossexamined.org. Click on online Christian courses. Check them out there. Sign up soon. We keep those premium courses small so you can have ample opportunity to interact live with the instructors. And these are some of the best instructors in the world.

All right let me go to Bruce, who writes from Utah. Here's his email. Again, I can only read some of it. It's very long. He said, "I just read the transcript to your podcast, Why Evangelicals Voted for Trump. Dr. Turek, I've heard you speak. I listen to a lot of your apologetics. I admire your work greatly. While you have a number of good points and make some cogent observations on why evangelicals may have voted for Trump, nonetheless, I'm extraordinarily disappointed in you after reading the transcript. You're not the person I would have guessed you from your apologetic work. I do not have time to read a point by point assessment from me, but I'll just make two points. Okay. Number one, your and other evangelical leaders' failure to loudly and consistently condemn Trump's behavior, his overt racism and misogamy, his hateful and anti-immigrant views, bullying lines, clearly selfish and self-centered and boorish behavior, is really beyond the pale."

All right let me stop right there. Bruce, I'm not sure you actually read the transcript closely. Because I do talk about those issues. Although I don't agree with you, his anti-immigrant views. He's not anti-immigrant. He's anti-illegal immigrant. And if we don't have secure borders, we don't have a country. He's right about that. And Israel had secure borders. Every nation has secure borders. You have a secure border on your house. You don't just let anybody in your house. Everybody agrees we need borders; the only question is where. In fact, I wrote a column last year. I think the title of it was something, why everybody believes in borders. You can go look that up if you want to. So, I'm not sure you really listened to the program, or read the transcript as closely as I think you may have suggested, because I have condemned Trump and continue to condemn his boorish behavior.

Then, the second objection that Bruce has is, "you make some overgeneralized statements that seemingly convict large groups of people. I'll highlight two in particular. A, all major media, though I'm sure you wouldn't include Fox News in that. Sorry, that was kind of snippy. Come on.
There is certainly a liberal media, conservative media, and some in between. All media always has some kind of bias. You need to get out of your echo chambers and listen, discern, and process, rather than generalize. Check out allsides.com.

Let me commend you, Bruce. That is an outstanding website. Thank you for that. Allsides.com, ladies and gentlemen, has news stories that, first of all, they rate where the news organization is. Whether it's right, center, or left. And I generally agree with how they rate these people. And so, they put stories up from all three sides; from right, center and left. So, Bruce, that's a good website. Thank you for that recommendation. Allsides.com. However, I think you're missing the point if you think that the media isn't biased left. Sure, there are some minor outlets that may be biased toward the right, like Breitbart, okay. That doesn't mean everything they say is false, just like it doesn't mean that everything's that say, Slate, which is biased to the left, says is false. I'm simply saying, they're coming at it from a particularly political angle. But what I'm saying is, the major media. Who are the major media? ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS, The New York Times, The Washington Post; and these people are decidedly leftist. And they put their opinion on the front page. As Cal Thomas has famously said, every day I read the Bible and the New York Times just to see what both sides are doing.

And if you think that there is not a liberal bias in the major media, you haven't been paying close attention. All you need to do is go to mediaresearchcenter.org. Mrc.org. Brent Bozell has been doing this for over 30 years. They track everything the major media says. Do you realize that in recent months, Trump's coverage in the major media has been 96% negative? 96%. Satan would get better coverage, okay. 96%. Now, whether you agree with Trump, or disagree with Trump, that's absurd, okay. No president is 96% negative. All right? No president in our history has been 96% negative. And yet, that is the kind of coverage that the major media puts out.

I love what Denzel Washington, the, the actor, who is a Christian, by the way, said. He said, "if you don't watch the news, you're uninformed. If you do watch the news, you're misinformed." He's absolutely right about that. So, what do you have to do? You have to search for news that's giving you objective facts. While everybody may have a bias, that doesn't mean that people can't report objective facts. First of all, to say that everybody is biased is self-defeating. Why? Because that would mean you're biased, and we shouldn't take your statement that
everybody is biased is true. We take that's biased as true. Sure, you may have a bias in your orientation toward a particular political viewpoint, but that doesn't mean that you can't report the facts objectively. You can report the facts objectively. I'm saying that the major media doesn't do that. It doesn't report the facts objectively. It doesn't do that. When 96% of the coverage is negative, you know, they're not doing it fairly. That's all I'm saying. Okay. And I could, we could spend hours doing this on this program. Pointing out major media bias. We don't have time. Just go to mrc.org and click on research. You'll see it all there.

All right. Secondly, the other problem that Bruce brings up that says that I'm condemning large groups of people. He says, "anyone who's a part of the left, you equate with the scribes and Pharisees of whom Jesus was so critical." He says, "in addition, you make the over-exaggerated accusation that the left would like to end certain things like life, liberty and the freedom of speech." Is that an exaggerated accusation? I'll deal with it right after the break. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek. Right after this two minute break, we'll be back, so don't go anywhere. Check out our website, also crossexamined.org, and the new online courses at crossexamined.org. Just click on it there. See in two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

The first show of 2020. Here we are, ladies and gentlemen, trying to provide clear vision on important issues everywhere. Today we're talking about the podcast I did a couple of weeks ago, four weeks ago. The radio program I did on, Why Evangelicals Voted for Trump. I'm dealing with some objections, people who disagreed with some of the things I said, on this program. Bruce is writing in from Utah and he said that basically, that I'm exaggerating ,when I say the left would like to end life, liberty, and freedom of speech. And I submit to you, Bruce, that is not an exaggeration. You can go to some of the college campuses I've been, and they don't let a lot of people speak. They don't have. The left would like to shut that down.

Also, they are ending lives. Certainly, up to the point of birth, and now even they're advocating death after birth, if the woman doesn't want the baby. If there's an abortion, and the baby is born live, they say, well just let it die. Okay. So, they are ending lives, Bruce. They [unintelligible] ending liberty and freedom of speech, and certainly freedom of religion. You can just ask Jack Phillips, Barronelle Stutzman, Aaron and Melissa Klein, Elaine Photography. These
are all florists, bakers, photographers, who have been put out of business, or almost put out of business, by the people who say they're fighting for tolerance. See, the Alliance Defending Freedom, the ADF, an organization I support because they bring needed attorney support to people who are in trouble. Under assault by the left because they say, in good conscience, they can't participate in a same-sex wedding. Either they're photographers, they're florists, they're bakers, whatever. ADF, Alliance Defending Freedom, gives them counsel free of charge. These are Christian, and other attorneys that are willing to, free of charge, support these people for freedom of religion and freedom of speech. The ADF wouldn't be necessary if the left didn't exist. Okay.

And then you take issue to something I quoted from Ed Mang. I don't have time to read it again. But I've since learned, thankfully, a listener to this program alerted me to the fact that, although I read a comment from Ed Mang, it probably wasn't Ed Mang who originally wrote that. He copied and pasted a column by Evan Sayet at townhall.com. This column was written in 2017. July 13, 2017. And the column is, He Fights. And Bruce is writing in saying that that column was claiming that when Ed says, are really it was Evan who said that the left has engaged in a war against America since the rise of the children of the 60s. That this is an overgeneralization and exaggeration. And Bruce writes, "don't you have any friends who are liberals? Are they not humans? Are they not made in the image of God? Or friends who are liberal and Christian? Yes, it's possible."

Again, Bruce, I do not think you actually listened to the show. Because I said, that's where I departed from Ed's comments, or Evan Sayet's comments. I think we're all made in the image of God and deserve respect. I love all people, but I don't agree with all people. And in fact, you're not agreeing with me right now. That's why you wrote this email, but I assume you love me. In fact, in order to love people, you have to disagree with them if they're advocating harmful policies. And Bruce goes on to write this. He writes, "I believe this podcast is just contributing to the enormous difficulty people already experienced in trying to engage in civil discourse. Why would I engage with someone who views me as less than, or the worst sort of human?"

Again, Bruce, I don't know what podcast you were reading, or what transcript you were reading. I said exactly the opposite, that everybody's made in the image of God, and we shouldn't treat people with disrespect. And that's one of the problems I have with Trump.
Sometimes he does disrespect people. I don't agree with that. But Bruce, I'm open to debating everyone respectfully. But too often, leftists don't want to debate. They want to cancel the debate by calling conservatives bigots and haters. So, there's no reason to lecture me, or any other conservatives, because with very few exceptions, conservatives are eager to debate the issues reasonably. It's the left that doesn't want to debate. Many on the left will attempt to put you out of business for even wanting to debate an issue. And if you don't think so, Bruce, again, you haven't been paying attention. You haven't been paying attention to the people I mentioned earlier; to the Barron Stutzmans of the world, Barronelle Stutzmans of the world, to the Jack Phillips of the world, to the Elaine Photographys of the world, to the to the Aaron and Melissa Klein's of the world, or to the Frank Tureks of the world.

Yeah, I want to go back to nine years ago. 2011. I'm doing corporate training for companies like Cisco and Bank of America. And I actually get fired by those companies, because in my own private time, I wrote a book called, Correct Not Politically Correct; How Same Sex Marriage Hurts Everyone. And it was leftists within the organization that wanted me fired. Not because I brought this topic up in my training at all, but because I held a different political view than they did. Now, I wrote a column called, Sex at Work, about this. Now by the way, do not Google that. Do not Google sex at work, okay. Go to crossexamined.org. Crossexamined.org and click on the search button there and type in, Sex at Work, and you'll find the column. I explain what really happened there. In the name of inclusion, tolerance, and diversity, I was excluded and not tolerated for holding a diverse view.

And I find this to be the prevalent attitude of people on the left. Not everybody. People like Andrew Sullivan, who's a homosexual man who is for same sex-marriage, obviously, he gets it. He understands that it's not right to do this to people who you disagree with politically. So, there are notable exceptions. But generally, Bruce, the left in this country wants to shut the debate down. And it's not just on issues of same-sex marriage. It's the issues on climate change. It's the issues on Trump even. It's the issues on immigration. They call you names rather than giving you arguments. So, I stand by what I said in that previous column, in the previous podcast, which apparently you really didn't read closely, I'm sorry, I can't help that. But it's there. Go back and look at it. And I appreciate you writing in and giving me your opinion. I just don't think that you're, you're really looking at the issues clearly and fairly, because I don't think you listened to the podcast or read the transcript closely.
And I think the left is more of a threat to our freedoms than you really think they are. And that freedom, by the way, includes our ability to, not only preach the gospel, but then to live it, as well. Okay? You can't just say, well, churches are going to be exempt from such and such a law. That's nonsense. Even if they were exempt from such and such a law, that might protect the pastor, but it's not going to protect the people in the church who then go out into the world and try and live the Christian life. The left wants to prevent you from doing that. So again, look at the issues a little bit more closely.

All right let me get to at least one question that you have sent in in just the remaining minutes I have. A couple of you have written in about your children going to college and leaving the faith. What's your advice? You're asking me what's my advice? In fact, I called the gentleman yesterday, who had written in about this, to help talk him off the ledge. The first thing you want to do, parents, if one of your children calls you and says, dad, I don't believe in God anymore, after they went to college; do not freak out, okay. Number one, don't do that. Because then they're not going to be open to discussing the matter with you.

In fact, Josh McDowell, the famous apologist, had his son, Sean McDowell, when Sean was about 20, come to him and say, dad, I don't know if I believe what you believe. Now. Josh, to his credit, didn't freak out. He simply said, in typical Josh manner, hey, that's great son, because your faith can't be my faith. You need to investigate this for yourself. He said but let me just ask you one thing. As you investigate the evidence, will you promise to me that you will follow the evidence where it leads? And Sean said, yes, I will dad. And then Josh said, great. Well then, let's look at the evidence together. Well today, Sean is a PhD and he's teaching apologetics at Biola. Okay? So, don't freak out. Because you want your child to come to you with these questions, and you want to work through this with your child, rather than then ostracize them, or make them feel uncomfortable when they bring up doubts about Christianity.

That's one of the problems we have in the church today. People are afraid to bring up their doubts. They're afraid to ask questions. You should be the person they want to go to first with questions. So, that's number one. Don't freak out. Be open to it. And then ask them this question. If Christianity were true, would you become a Christian. Or if you want to take Christianity out of it say, if Jesus really rose from the dead to prove he was God, would you
follow him. And then be quiet and see what they say. If the person hesitates, or says no, you know the problem is not intellectual, it's volitional or moral. They don't want it to be true. Look, they're out at college. They're on their own for the first time. I get it. You get it. You've been there. You don't want to do everything your parents said when you go to college. You don't want God to exist in many cases, when you go to college. God's inconvenient. And so, point out to them that it's not really an intellectual issue.

The gentleman I was talking to last night has his son bringing up all these objections about the Gospel of Thomas and all this. You can go down that rabbit trail if you want, but the Gospel of Thomas is not his issue. Something else is going on. Okay. You want to find out if he's really open to the truth. If he's not, then you need to deal with that issue. You need to pray more and talk less. That's what Dr. Geisler always used to say. When kids rebelled; pray more, talk less. This is not a matter of God's existence, it's a matter of the kid's resistance. He doesn't want Christianity to be true right now. So, ask the question. And then you can go through the evidence if the kid is open to the evidence. All right?

If it's just a matter of intellectual doubt, that's easy. You can get books like, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist; or On Guard, from William Lane Craig; or Mere Christianity, from CS Lewis; or Cold Case Christianity, from J. Warner Wallace; or a million other books. Okay. Evidence is easy. It's the emotional, volitional, moral issues that arise that cause people to say, look, I don't want God to exist. I want to go my own way. For that, you gotta ask questions. And you got to pray more and talk less.

All right friends, I'm Frank Turek. Great being with you. And I'll be with you again next week, Lord willing. Don't forget about Doubting Toward Faith, the new online course coming up this week. And a couple of weeks from now, the course on Textual Criticism, with the great Dan Wallace. Go to crossexamined.org. Click on online courses. See you next week.