

## What Does Sex Mean?

(June 19, 2020)

What does sex mean according to the Supreme Court? Yeah, you're probably wondering where I was going with that. The Supreme Court just had a decision this past week. What does it mean to the country? What does it mean to Christians? What does it mean to human rights? We're going to talk about that today.

In fact, I've just written a column. It's on One News Now, it's on stream.org, it's on townhall.com, it's on our website, crossexamined.org, and a few other sites. The title is, 5 Casualties of the Court's LGBTQ Sex Ruling. Got to get all those letters in there. What was this decision all about? How did the court arrive at this decision? And in fact, after I go through some of these casualties, there are five of them, I'm going to try and explain how in 2020 this decision could be made. It goes all the way back to Aristotle, actually, all the way back to Adam and Eve. But Aristotle will be our key, a figure here that we're going to look at a little bit later in the program, so don't go anywhere.

And let me just start out by pointing out that there are five casualties, there's more than that, but five casualties that I can could fit into 1200 words for a column about this ruling. And what sex now means, according to the Supreme Court in civil rights law, is it means sexual orientation, or whatever gender you think you are. That's the result of this Supreme Court decision, Bostock versus Clayton County. And the person who wrote the majority opinion is Justice Neil Gorsuch. Oh, he was supposed to be a conservative, remember.

Well, here are some problems with the ruling. The first problem, or the first casualty, I should say, is you and me, We the People, because if you think you have the ability to govern yourself through your elected representatives, the United States Supreme Court just made a mockery of that constitutional principle. Again, they've done this before. You know, you can work to elect the right people, pass the right laws, and then you'll just see a handful of unelected lawyers on the Supreme Court nullify or replace your laws, the ones that you work for, with their own laws. That's what the six justices did this week. They changed the 1964 civil rights law into a law that

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

they desired, despite the fact that the very changes that they made, the Supreme Court made, have been rejected by Congress in recent years. So, just like that, sex no longer means biological sex, but it could also mean sexual orientation, or whatever a person thinks their sex is at the time.

Now, Justices Alito and Thomas wrote a dissent, as did justice Kavanaugh. And Justice Alito and Thomas wrote this. They said, "there's only one word for what the court did today. Legislation." They went on to say, "a more brazen abuse of our authority to interpret statues is hard to recall." Now, what does this all mean? The court is legislating from the bench. The court is changing the laws of the United States by their own preferences. Now, many might agree with the result of this particular decision. It's going to have some big negatives I'm going to talk about here in a minute. One of them is their usurping the will of the people.

But the means by which this result was achieved should disturb everyone who's an American. Why? Because it strikes at the very heart of our constitution and our rights as people to govern ourselves. It's a complete injustice for judges to impose their legislative will on the people. Look, if they want to change the law, if a judge wants to change the law, then he has to do what every any other citizen has to do. He's got to convince his fellow citizens to go through the difficult legislative process to get the law changed. To merely impose his or her will on the people is what we call tyranny. But that's what's going on in our country. It's been going on in this country for a long time. And it's what frustrates so many people, because they work hard to put laws into place, and then justices come along and say, no, we don't like your laws. We're gonna put our laws in place. That is not representative democracy, ladies and gentlemen, or a representative republic. That's being ruled. That's six people, six unelected people, ruling over 335 million. You want to change the law? Go through the legislative process.

So, the first casualty in this decision is, we the people. The second casualty, ironically, is women. Why women? Because Justice Gorsuch's opinion furthers the leftist claim that sex is defined, not by biology, but by one state of mind. Therefore, if a man thinks he's a woman, then the law must treat him as a woman. Although Gorsuch tries to deny this result in the opinion, he tries to say, well, this doesn't follow. No, it does follow. What Gorsuch has actually done is he's given legal grounds for biological men to gain legal advantage over actual biological women in the workplace, in the bathroom, and of course, on the athletic field and other places.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

I mean, think about it this way, ladies. You're at your job, you want a promotion, right. All other things being equal, do you think your employer is now going to promote you or the man transitioning to become a woman who now has heightened legal grounds, as an even smaller minority, to sue for discrimination? What is the employer going to do? The employer is going to protect him or herself and say, well, I'm not gonna promote you. I'm gonna promote this transgendered person, because if I don't, then I'm going to open myself up for a lawsuit.

Ladies, do you want privacy and safety in the bathroom and showering facilities? What policy is your employer or your gym going to adopt? The common sense one, where biological men and women are separate, or the one that prevents a costly discrimination suit by inviting men into women's facilities? What's gonna happen here? Women are now at a disadvantage because of this decision because the court imposed their will on the nation.

Also, the third group of people, or the third casualty in this decision, believe it or not, is LGBTQ people. You say, how can that be? This is supposed to help them, right. Well, yes and no. You'll see why no here in a minute. Because what Gorsuch has done, he's not just made it harder for women, his reasoning actually contradicts the very rationale for the existence of women and LGBTQ people that he supposedly trying to help. How so? Because, when someone identifies as a woman, or a man, or a lesbian, or homosexual, they are actually pre-supposing there is such a thing as objective biological sex. I mean, how can one have sex with someone of the same sex unless one can differentiate that person from the opposite sex? And how can a man transition into becoming a woman unless men and women actually exist? There's no way to transition from one to another unless you know what a man is, unless you know what a woman is.

You see, the whole LGBTQ ideology pre-supposes the fixed genders. But according to Gorsuch, those fixed genders don't necessarily exist. Because if you in your mind think you're a woman when you're really a man, oh, well, you're a woman then. And that objective standard of biology goes away. And so, does any rationale to say, you're LGBTQ, or a man, or woman. Because without the fixed genders, none of this makes any sense. Of course, contradiction was never a problem. For the Supreme Court, they contradict themselves routinely. Now Gorsuch asserts that either one's biology or psychology can determine one's sex. But if a person's

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

subjective psychology usurps their objective biology, then there's no objective way of identifying anyone as a man, woman, or LGBTQ. Sex and sexual identity are just figments of the imagination. Much like Gorsuch's justification for his opinion. It's just a figment of his imagination. He's just making it up as he goes. This has no grounding in our laws. He's just making it up.

You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. You have questions, you can email questions. The email is [hello@crossexamined.org](mailto:hello@crossexamined.org). [Hello@crossexamined.org](mailto:Hello@crossexamined.org). And hopefully we'll get to that in a future program. But don't go away. We're back in just two minutes.

Ad: Can you help me with something? Can you go up to iTunes or wherever you listen to this podcast and give us a five-star review? Why? It will help more people see this podcast and therefore hear it. So, if you could help us out there, I'd greatly appreciate it.

Welcome back to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Want to give you a bit of a personal update. Thank you for praying for my family. My dad is in Hospice, as you know, in Florida. I just returned this week to Charlotte. I'll be going back to Florida again soon. In fact, he's probably getting fairly close. But it's really hard to judge these things. And that's ultimately our goal anyway, in God's time, so we wait on God for that. And he's 84 years old. He knows where he's going.

One advantage, as you know, of having a terminal illness is that you can tie up loose ends and nothing is left unsaid. I mean, my dad and I have always had a good relationship. We've told each other we love one another a lot. And so, we didn't need to tie up anything, but it still is a positive. One positive aspect of this is that you can talk about any issue without it being awkward, really, because when you know the end is coming. It's time to put aside the trivialities of life and talk about what really matters. So, that's one of the advantages of this.

I also want you to continue to pray for Tim Keller, if you would, who has pancreatic cancer. Rush Limbaugh who has lung cancer, as you know. In fact, David Limbaugh, Rush's brother, is on our board here at [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Wonderful man. He's written a column on what we're talking about today, as well. You should check that out at [townhall.com](http://townhall.com) or [stream.org](http://stream.org).

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Today we're talking about this column, and this column I just wrote called, 5 Casualties of the Court's LGBTQ Sex Ruling, and I'm going to expand upon it in this podcast, because 1200 words, I couldn't say everything I wanted to say. I really want to get to the root of why decisions like this come in 2020 to our Supreme Court. How they can make decisions like this. What's the history of this? How did how did this happen? It goes all the way back to Adam and Eve, obviously, but also all the way back to a denial of Aristotle. You say, how does that...we'll get there, just stick with me.

We were talking of the five casualties, and just before the break, we were talking about the third casualty, LGBTQ people. Because if you if you negate the standard of biology, men and women, you've negated the rationale for men and women and LGBTQ, as well. In fact, that's why some lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and feminists, feminists, for example, like JK Rowling, I think her name is, she wrote all the Harry Potter series. She came out with a recent 3,600 word essay called, JK Rowling Writes About Her Reasons for Speaking Out on Sex and Gender Issues. She, unlike so many in our culture, will not back down when she gets pushed back from the transgender ideology people. She goes right back at them. And she wrote a pretty eloquent 3,600 word essay on that. You can see it linked in my column.

And there are people who identify as LGBTQ, particularly the L, the G, and the B, who in recent years, at the Heritage Foundation, had a kind of powwow, a panel discussion, if you will, at the Heritage Foundation. And Ryan T. Anderson actually chaired this panel. And you can see their hour, or so, long conversation in the link from the column that I wrote, 5 Casualties of the Court's LGBTQ Sex Ruling. You can see that entire discussion they had. And these are people that don't agree with the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank, on virtually anything, except transgender ideology. Because if you say there are no fixed genders, LGBTQ people don't really exist in either men or women. They're all just figments of our imagination. So, check that out on the links that I just mentioned here. They're in the column. I should say, the links are in the column if you want to see that panel discussion right there, because Justice Gorsuch's opinion, that he just affirmed, defines LGBTQ people right out of existence. I know he's trying to help them, and maybe he is legally, but he's defied the rationale for such people out of existence. If everything's in your mind, and not in any objective biology, then there's really no way to say someone is LGBTQ, or man, or woman.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Okay, so we've got these three casualties; we the people, women, and LGBTQ people. The fourth casualty is 96% of the population. Why do I say that? Look, you ask anyone in corporate America today this question; are you more likely to experience problems at work for supporting LGBTQ political goals or opposing them? What do you think the answer is? It's not even close. I personally found this out back in 2011. This is nine years ago. I wrote a book called, *Correct Not Politically Correct: Same Sex Marriage Hurts Everyone*. Never brought it up at work. But somebody at Cisco, who I was doing some training for at the time, and Bank of America, as well, found out about it and I was fired immediately as a consultant. You can read all about it. I have a column at [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org) called, *Sex at Work*. Do not Google that. Go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org) and type it in the search engine. Do not Google, *sex at work*. Go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org), type it into in the search engine, and you'll find the article as to what happened. I don't have time to get into it now. Some of you already know. But it's also linked in this current column.

The truth is, is that HR departments in corporate America are proponents of everything LGBTQ. And for those who identify as such, these folks are actually better off than their straight counterparts, because LGBTQ households, on average, earn more than traditional households. And gay men earn 10% more than straight men. Now, there are some individual exceptions. That's why this this case rose to the Supreme Court. Somebody was claiming discrimination. But there appears to be no systematic discrimination, no systematic problem of anti-LGBTQ bias in the workplace. To the contrary, it's the opposite. LGBTQ people are celebrated. They don't need special treatment. It's maybe the people that oppose them that do.

Yet this Court's decision will employ the strong arm of government to fix a problem that doesn't exist. The decision is going to force companies to give employment preference to a long list of sexual orientations that, at best, 4% of the people claim. And that 4% already has a financial advantage. So, anyone who claims an LGBTQ identity will now have more job security than John or Jane Doe. You say, how so? Because if a company say has to downsize, who are they gonna let go? One of the helpless does, or a person of a newly preferenced minority who can bring a costly lawsuit alleging discrimination. Who are they going to let go? They're not going to let go the person that can sue them. They're going to let go John or Jane Doe. So, this is actually just resulting in reverse discrimination.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now, reverse discrimination is not the intent of this decision, but it's the inevitable consequence. As soon as you give preferential treatment to one group of people, you are automatically disadvantaging anyone not part of that group. Not only that, there isn't any medical consensus as to what sexual orientation or transgenderism is. But the effect of this decision is that businesses, and maybe even ministries, we'll see friends, to those who identify with a long list of special genders; ambigender, bigender, blurred gender, [unintelligible] gender, conflict gender, cosmic gender, etc., etc., etc. I don't even know what these mean. Most people don't know what they mean. Well, there's no objective of definition for any of these things. That's the whole point. It's all just made up in your mind.

What is Facebook at? 59 such genders and now you can even customize? Maybe they have more now. I don't know. That was a couple years ago, they came up with 59. How is it possible for a business owner to even know you're in compliance if you can't define what compliance is? And how many young workers are going to simply claim one of these nebulous labels just to get an advantage? Yeah, I'm pangender. You can't discriminate against me. I'm gender spiral. You can't discriminate against me. You could discriminate against him, or her, because they don't claim one of those labels.

Look, these claims for special treatment can't be objectively disproven, like Elizabeth Warren's claim to be a Native American. You could objectively disprove that. You could do a blood test, which they did. She's not Native American. But you can't do a blood test for gender fluid. Because if your gender is just in your mind, then there's no objective way of discovering what somebody is. There's no objective way of discovering whether somebody is just saying that to get an advantage or they really are that. The bottom line is, this decision doesn't fix an existing workplace problem. Actually, LGBTQ folks are doing very well. Thankfully. I don't want anyone to do poorly. They're doing well in the workplace. Instead, this decision creates legal and administrative chaos. And it legally justifies reverse discrimination against an already underperforming 96% of the population.

Now that's anything but equality ladies and gentlemen. That's not equality. That's giving a very small minority, who can't even be defined except by what they think, an advantage over 96% of the population. Now, maybe we're gonna have probably, it will be more than 4% now claiming

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

one of these genders, because they're gonna get an advantage over it. But still, most of the population is going to be disadvantaged because of this. That's not equality.

I think I saw a Babylon Bee headlines. Our friends at the Babylon Bee always keeping things light and giving us a chuckle when we need it. I don't have it in front of me, but it said something like this...Trump claims to be gay and transgendered so he can't be fired. Something like that. I mean, now there's truth in that, right. Obviously, he's elected, but if he was in the workplace, that would be a shield for you to say, oh, you can't fire me. And by the way, this actually makes the Civil Rights Act less effective for blacks...I didn't have time to put this in the column because we were running out of room...less effective for blacks, the very people the civil rights legislation was trying to protect, because now you have even a smaller minority protected over African Americans, the LGBTQ people. So, it's actually destroying the reason the Civil Rights Act was put into place to begin with, or at least making it weaker.

All right, I'm Frank Turek. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, on the American Family Radio Network. We're back in two minutes.

Ad: Friends, Frank Turek here. I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist is a listener supported radio program and podcast. So, if you like what you hear here, would you consider donating to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org)? 100% of your donations go to ministry, zero percent too buildings. We're completely virtual. So, if you can help us out, we'd greatly appreciate it. Thank you so much.

We're going back to Israel, ladies and gentlemen, this September. If you want to be a part of this amazing trip, you need to go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org) and click on the events. You'll see the VIP trip to Israel. My friend Eli Shukron, the Israeli archaeologist who discovered the pool of Siloam and excavate excavated most of the City of David, among other places, will be our guide as we go through the top sites in Israel, and also stay at the best hotels. It's called a VIP trip. You know when you do a trip to Israel it's not walk where Jesus walked, it's run where Jesus walked, because you're trying to see so much in a short period of time that you wind up getting tired. And that's why we stay at the best hotels, because we want people to really enjoy themselves and get good sleep while we're getting ready for the next day. And it is just an amazing I just love going Israel, so I hope you guys can join us.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

We only take one bus. We could take more. We filled up the first bus, but then the trip got canceled because of Coronavirus. And so, now some of the people who were gonna go in April can't go in September, so we now have some seats open. We could blow by that, but we don't, because we just want one bus. Everybody be on one bus and have the camaraderie and not have too many people at any site we go to. So, if you want to be a part of that, go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org) and click on events. You'll see the trip there.

And then in February, we're going to do a trip to the real Mount Sinai, what we think is the real Mount Sinai, in Saudi Arabia. We're going to start in Jordan, go to Saudi Arabia, get on a yacht, actually. And a big yacht, holds like, I don't know, maybe 100 people. Go through the Red Sea, and even wind up in Egypt, and then ultimately some folks are gonna go on to Israel. After that, I'll leave and go back home from Egypt, but those trips are going to be great. If you want to be a part of them, again, go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org) and click on events.

So, we're talking about the 5 Casualties of the Court's LGBTQ Sex Ruling. And I'm taking most of this from a column that I just wrote, which you can see at [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org), One News Now, Stream, Townhall.com, some other places, and we've gone through four of them. These are the four casualties so far; we the people, women, LGBTQ people, and 96% of the population. Outside of that it's a really good decision. What's the fifth casualty? Well, I mentioned one just before the break, and that is African Americans are actually not served by this, because now there's a smaller minority that usurps them in the workplace, the LGBTQ group. So, the very reason the civil rights legislation in 1964 was put into place was for the African American community, and now that has been usurped by the LGBTQ community. And that group is based on behavior, which has a moral dimension to it, whereas race has no moral dimension.

In other words, there's no reason to be against somebody because of their race. Race has no impact on one's behavior, but LGBTQ, they are behaviors, and so people can have valid moral grounds for saying those behaviors, I don't think, are moral. But you have no moral reason to be against somebody because of their race. There's one race, the human race, and we shouldn't just be non-racist. We should be anti-racist. Racism is a sin, especially if Christianity is true. And it is. Now we've talked about this on the previous two programs. Maybe next week, we'll return to it. It's a big issue in our country right now. But I just want to point that out, that actually

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

another casualty is African Americans in this decision. I could have come up with 10 casualties, but I came up with five and had to end because of the space limit on a column.

But here's the fifth casualty in the column religious freedom. Look if any group is being discriminated against in corporate America, it is Christians and other conservatives who are hiding under their desks for fear of being outed, excluded, and shamed by the people who say they're fighting for inclusion, tolerance, and diversity. Yeah, those police, the mob. Now, are religious people, are their rights, their first amendment rights now nullified? How about Christian, or Muslim, or Jewish schools; are they now forced to hire teachers and administrators who contradict their natural law and scriptural views of proper sexual behavior? Will religious people now have to get special permission from the Supreme Court to say and live as if there's only two genders created for one another?

Well, according to the decision, Justice Gorsuch says, those questions are questions for another case. Now, given his faulty reasoning skills and his legislative impulse in this case, I'm not very optimistic that he's going to respect reason or the constitution the next time either. Now, what do I mean by his faulty reasoning skills? Well, some of them I've mentioned in here, but Ryan Anderson has a column to which I linked in my column, which goes through more of the legal reasons and analogies that Gorsuch brings up that don't work. They're false analogies. And Brian T. Anderson points those out in his column. If you go to my column and click on the faulty reasoning skills link, you'll see that column by Anderson.

Now, the question is, where do we go from here? What do we do now with regard to this decision? And then we're going to get into Aristotle and where this all comes from. Anderson, in his column, has a three suggestions, or maybe four suggestions, on what to do. Here's what he says. First, Congress should explicitly state that when it uses the word sex in civil rights statutes, it does not refer to sexual orientation and gender identity. It could clearly state that Gorsuch's logic of sex discrimination is not that of Congress. Second, if Congress is unwilling to directly correct the court, and this Congress is unwilling. Nancy Pelosi agrees with this decision, despite the fact that it's disastrous, as I already mentioned. Brian Anderson says, Congress should provide robust religious liberty protections to ensure that this mistaken theory of sex discrimination does not harm the free exercise of religion.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

I agree with that. But let me just say, this is not just a freedom of religion issue, because it makes it sound like well, your religion just gives you the right to be a bigot. No, we're not bigoted for saying that certain sexual behaviors are right and other sexual behaviors are wrong. That's the result of reason, and the result of good argumentation, and the result of looking at scriptures, which have reason to believe they are true revelations from God. So, it's not bigotry to say that biology is important to sex. It's just reason, and common sense, and scripturally supported, which are also supported by reason. But I agree that freedom of religion is something that should be protected, quite obviously.

And then Anderson says third, Congress should protect certain actions and decisions as not constituting discrimination. This would protect the ability of all institutions, for example, to offer single sex facilities and programs. You could think athletics on the basis of biology rather than identity. So yeah, your gym could say, look, it's not discrimination to have men and women bathrooms. In fact, the very people who are supporting this decision, like the corporate elite, the people at these big corporations, they still have men and women restrooms, right? Because obviously it protects people.

Now, are they going to suddenly make all restrooms gender neutral? Good luck with that, friends. They might have to according to this ruling. That's going to create a whole nother can of worms and it's going to create safety problems, particularly for women. But that's what happens when you get away from the true meaning of the law, like the Supreme Court did, or you get away with the constitution, like the Supreme Court did.

The last thing Ryan Anderson says in this column, he says, so too Congress could clarify that bans on sex discrimination do not require any institution to allow males to compete against females in athletics or use women only locker rooms and shelters. It could explicitly say that no physician has to engage in so called gender-affirming care, and that no individual or institution would have to act in ways that undermine the conviction that marriage is the union of a husband and wife. Americans disagree about sex. That's not news, but how we manage this disagreements will be. That's from Ryan Anderson's column, which again, is linked to in my column.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, the point here is, is that there is a way forward despite the fact that people say, well if the Supreme Court said it, there's not much we can do about it. No, there are things we can do about it. In fact, I'd love if Trump would say, oh, just like Andrew Jackson did many years ago. Oh, that's the Supreme Court? Great. Let's see what army they have in order to enforce it. At some point, somebody needs to say, that decision is illegitimate. It is such a brazen abuse of power. You are not supporting and defending the Constitution. You are disobeying your oath to support and defend the Constitution, because the constitution clearly says opposite of what you're saying. Somebody's just got to say that at some point. Now, it's going to create a constitutional crisis, but oh, well, we're already in a constitutional crisis, because nobody's obeying the constitution on the Supreme Court. Well, three of them are: Alito, Kavanaugh, and Thomas, in this case.

All right, I feel better now. How about you? Now let's go back to where did this all come from? Where did this idea that there's no fixed sexual nature come from? Where does this absurd thinking come from? What's its source? Three things. Number one; the denial of God? It goes all the way back to the Garden of Eden, when Satan came in and said, did God really say there are men and women? Really? That's number one. Number two; the denial of objective natures, like human nature, like woman nature, like man nature. And number three; the denial of objective purpose. Objective purpose to human beings, objective purpose to sex, objective purpose to life. And Aristotle is very significant in this regard. Why? Because Aristotle was the first thinker to really systematize these things.

Now, obviously, Moses did in Genesis, but not in a systematic way. Moses just presupposed it was all true because he was given revelation it's all true. Aristotle systematized that thought. And in fact, Aristotle's thought was so significant that my friend Ed Feser, who wrote a classic book called *The Last Superstition*, which you need to read, he wrote it back in 2008. It was actually a polemic against the new atheists at the time. And here's what he says in this *Last Superstition* book. He says, "How significant is Aristotle? Well, I wouldn't want to exaggerate, so let me put it this way. Abandoning Aristotle, as the founders of modern philosophy did, was the single greatest mistake ever made in the entire history of Western thought."

Oh, he's not exaggerating, is he? Abandoning Aristotle was this single greatest mistake ever made in the entire history of Western thought. Not in everything Aristotle said, but on natures.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Because abandoning Aristotle, what Faser means is that ,abandoning among other things, objective natures and purposes. And when we come back from the break, we're going to talk about this. This is the source of these inane rulings we get 2400 years later.

You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. By the way, our website is [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). That's crossexamined with a D on the end of it .org. We're back in two minutes.

Ad: If you find value in the content of this podcast, don't forget to follow us on Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter. Join our online community to have great conversations, grow in your knowledge of God, and become a better defender of the Christian faith. Also, don't forget to subscribe to our YouTube channel, where we have hundreds of videos, and over 100,000 subscribers that are part of an online family. Find those by searching for Frank Turek or CrossExamined in the search bar. You can find many more resources like articles, online courses, free downloadable materials, event calendars, and more at [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org).

If you're low on the FM dial looking for a National Public Radio go no further. You're never gonna hear this on NPR. That's okay. We're trying to give you the truth here. Hopefully, we are. If you think we aren't, you can email us [hello@crossexamine.org](mailto:hello@crossexamine.org). Or if you have a question, you can email us there. And today we're talking about the 5 Casualties of the Court's LGBTQ Sex Ruling. That ruling was called, Bostock versus Clayton County. And you can find the column, from which I took much of this program, on our website, [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org), or at [stream.org](http://stream.org), or at [OneNewsNow.com](http://OneNewsNow.com), or at [TownHall.com](http://TownHall.com). There are a few other places it's at, as well. And right now, in this segment we're talking about where this all came from. What's the foundation of this kind of thinking? How do people in 2020 think about this?

Well, there's a long line of philosophy behind it. But it goes back to the denial of Aristotle. Not Aristotle's physics. You know, Aristotle thought the center of the universe was the earth, or the sun, or something like that. No, not that. But his metaphysics, because he gets metaphysics mostly right. Things beyond the physical. And abandoning objective natures and objective purposes is what Ed Faser means when he says, abandoning Aristotle was the single greatest mistake ever in the entire history of Western thought. Here's how Faser puts it from his book, *The Last Superstition*. "More than any other intellectual factor, this abandonment has

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

contributed to the civilizational crisis through which the West has been living for several centuries, and which has accelerated massively in the last century or so. It is implicated in the disintegration of confidence in the rational adjustability of morality and religious belief in the widespread assumption that a scientific picture of human nature entails that free will is an illusion."

You've heard me talk about that before. Daniel Dennett says free will is an illusion. One wonders if he was conscious when he said that, or if he had free will, when he said that. Sam Harris also says free will is an illusion. Well, how did you freely come to that conclusion? Okay, back to Faser. He says that, "this abandonment of Aristotle has led to the belief that there is a mind body problem, and that the only scientifically and philosophically respectable solution to it is some version of materialism."

You also heard me speak about that a lot before on this program. That if materialism is true, there's no way to know anything's true. Anyway, back to Faser. He says, "it's resulted in the proliferation of varieties of relativism and irrationalism", Supreme Court decisions, "and also of scientism, and hyper-rationalism in the modern world's corrosive skepticism about the legitimacy of any authority", except the Supreme Court, "and the radical individualism and collectivism that have followed in its wake. And in the intellectual and practical depersonalization of man, that all of this has entailed, and which has, in turn, led to mass murder on a scale unparalleled in human history. It's logical implications can be seen in today's headlines, in the abortion industry, slaughter of millions upon millions of unborn beings, in the judicial murder of Terry Schiavo..." You may remember that case from about 15 years ago. "...and the push for euthanasia generally, in the movement for same sex marriage and the sexual revolution generally, and 1000 other things besides", says Ed Faser, in his book, *The Last Superstition*.

Now you say, how so? Because when you deny objective natures, when you deny objective purposes, you get rid of all human rights. So, think about it this way. For Aristotle, and believers in the Bible, conservatives, Aquinas, Moses, Paul, Jesus; all these people believed that natures and purposes are real. That they're not reducible to anything, either material or mental. In other words, they are not just figments of your imagination, like the Supreme Court thinks. Natures and purposes are objective features of reality. They don't change when you change

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

your mind. A human is a human even if he thinks he's a parrot. A man is a man because he has a man nature, even if he thinks he's a woman. The purpose of the heart is to pump blood, regardless if you think otherwise. The purpose of an acorn is to become an oak tree, regardless of what you think otherwise. The purpose of sex is procreation, and the man woman binding, regardless of what you think otherwise. The ultimate purpose of life is to know the good, and the ultimate good is God, regardless of what you think otherwise.

Now, if you deny objective purposes, and objective natures, you've denied the existence of any objective rights, for if there is no human nature, then there are no human rights. How could there be human rights if there are no humans? There's no objective human nature. If there is no woman nature, then there are no woman rights. Which is exactly what I was saying earlier about some of the feminists saying, hey, if we're going to buy into transgender ideology, if we're going to buy into the idea that your sex is what you think you are, then how do you identify who a woman is? If a man wants to just identify as a woman, and he goes into the workplace, he has to be treated like a woman? That's gonna disadvantage me, who's a real woman, these feminists will say. And they're right.

If there is no purpose to life, there's no right way to live it. Just like if there is no purpose to a football game, there's no right way to play it. If there's no purpose to a football game, there'd be no way for you to say that your quarterback throwing a touchdown is better than your quarterback throwing an interception, because there's no way to judge whether a particular action will take you closer to the goal, or the purpose, or further away, if there is no goal or purpose. Look, if a person's sex is determined by their thoughts that contradict their nature, which we measure sometimes by DNA, you now have no objective means for even discovering what sex is. Sex is subjective. Sex is in the subject, their thoughts, not the object, their nature. If sex is subjective, then there are no sexual rights. But sexual rights are exactly what the Supreme Court is trying to assert.

You see the problem here? The elites on the Supreme Court destroy the foundation of rights and then they try and build a house of rights on top of it. You can't have it both ways. They try to create objective rights, while at the same time destroying the very foundation of objective rights. If there's no fixed reference point, if there's no fixed standard, how do they even know their ruling is correct? Certainly, the constitution or existing civil rights laws, that's not their

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

reference point. They've abandoned both of those standards by legislating from the bench. They just dismissed what the 1964 law said They just changed it. They said this is what it means now. By what standard? If there are no natures or purposes, everything is subjective and so are rights. They are mere preferences, which is about all you can say about what the court has done. They've imposed their subjective preferences on 335 million people and thrown the workplace into chaos.

That's what's happened. And how did it happen? Well, it wasn't just because these individuals got to the Supreme Court. This goes all the way back into human thought when modern philosophers began to abandon realism, which was originally systematized by Aristotle, baptized by Aquinas, and has been part of Christian thinking and natural law thinking for centuries. And that was abandoned, partially by David Hume, and then Emmanuel Kant. David Hume lived in the 1700s, Emmanuel Kant lived in 1800s. We trace some of this, by the way, in our book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, if you're interested in that.

But if you buy into all this subjectivism, like the court has, you've negated the very possibility to have rights at all, because you've negated the very possibility to even determine who a man is, or who a woman is, or who a human is, or who an LGBTQ individual is. So, they've destroyed the foundation while trying to build a house on it. And now we're left to pick up the pieces because the court can't think straight.

And of course, this guy was put on the court by Donald Trump. But who did Donald Trump pick? Donald Trump picked judges recommended to him by The Federalist Society, who is supposed to pick conservative justices. Really? I guess they can't be trusted now either. Look, I've discovered something while observing politics over the past 50 years. Republicans sometimes appoint bad justices, sometimes good justices. Democrats always, always appoint bad justices. Who are the other five people other than Gorsuch on this opinion? Well, Roberts. Roberts apparently now looks like a very bad pick by Bush. But the other four, all picked by President Clinton. Who are the other four? Clinton or Obama. Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan, and Ginsburg. They always vote the wrong way. They always vote against the Constitution. Well, I shouldn't say always. Okay, when it comes to these issues, they certainly do. They just ignore it, because they have an ideology that they want to promote. An ideology that they want to impose on 335 million other people.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, yeah, sometimes Republicans appoint bad people, unbeknownst to them. Donald Trump doesn't know anything about judges, quite obviously. He's a businessman. He's just going on what The Federalist Society says. And apparently, I saw someone recently, who was a conservative when Gorsuch was put up and said, we don't want to put this guy on, because he goes to a gay affirming church and he actually presided over same sex wedding. Well, now the truth comes out. I guess he just decided he would go all the way on this. And as I say, although it may seem on the surface to be a win for LGBTQ people, it's a win and a loss, because he basically just said you don't really exist in any rational way.

All right, I'm Frank Turek. Check out our website, [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). Don't forget about the trips to Israel coming up. Hope you can join me. And I hope to see you here next week. We may talk about the race issue again. God bless y'all. See you next time.

Ad: If you benefit from this podcast, help others find it. Just go to iTunes, or any other podcast service you might be using, to listen and leave us a five-star rating on the, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast with Dr. Frank Turek. It will take you less than five seconds. You can also help a lot by leaving us a positive review for others to see. This podcast is available on iTunes, Spotify, Google Play, Stitcher, TuneIn, and many other audio content delivery apps. Thank you and God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)