Why Has the World Gone Mad? C.S. Lewis & Paul Tell Us
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What explains the super extreme, even mad positions we've seen people take publicly in recent years ladies and gentlemen? Both the Apostle Paul and CS Lewis will reveal why. Now, we'll get to them in a minute but what do I mean by super extreme, even mad positions? Question: How did we go from safe, legal, and rare with regard to abortion to the government, meaning the taxpayer, is going to pay for your abortion? How did we go from safe, legal, and rare to shout your abortion? How did we go from safe, legal, and rare...

By the way, these were the words that President Clinton used 25 years ago; safe, legal, and rare. How did we go from that to now we're going to celebrate abortion by making it legal right up to the moment of birth? In fact, we're going to even light up buildings in New York City in celebration of having such a law to allow abortion right up to the moment of birth, as the disgraced Governor Cuomo did a couple of years ago when they passed that law in New York.

How did we go from safe, legal, and rare to where we are now actually making it legal to kill children 28 days after birth? And if anyone in law enforcement investigates a death during this time, they can be prosecuted. If you think I'm making this up, you just need to go listen to the podcast we had with Jack Hibbs just a couple of weeks ago, because AB 2223 in California will do exactly that if it's passed. You can actually kill your child 28 days after birth, and if anyone investigates the death, they could be prosecuted. I'm not making this up.

How did we go from the idea of tolerating different sexual lifestyles to the point now where your kindergartener, not only needs to be taught about homosexuality and transgenderism, you need to affirm it in them? And if you don't, the government might take your child away from you. Again, you think I'm making this up. This was actually put in a memo from a branch of HHS, by the Biden administration, just about a month ago, where they literally said that if your three to five year old thinks they're the opposite sex, you need to affirm it in them. And they set it up to say that the government might come in and take your child away from you if you don't affirm it in them.
How did we go from, believe every woman, just four years ago in the Cavanaugh hearings to what's a woman? How did we go from there are women's rights to there are no women? We don't even know what a woman is. There are now more than 50 genders. How did we do this? How did we go from gender dysphoria is a mental abnormality to anyone who thinks that it is now an abnormality is him or herself abnormal? That you're crazy if you don't think transgenderism is something that ought to be celebrated, something that's ought to be promoted. Now, you're crazy, apparently, according to some.

Now, I agree with my friend Charlie Kirk here, that about 95% of the people in our country actually say and actually believe that there are just two genders. And yes, gender dysphoria, although it affects a very small minority of people, is something that needs to be treated with psychiatry. It shouldn't be treated with surgery. But 95% of the people are afraid to say that.

How did we go from reforming the police to defund the police? How did we go from having a dream about judging people not on their race, but on their behavior, to teaching kids the opposite, to judge people on their race regardless of their behavior? How did we go from desegregation to now resegregation? For example, Columbia University, among other universities, now they have a black only graduation. They even have LGBTQ only graduations. And many colleges now have black only dorms. Can you imagine if a college had a white only dorm, if we went backwards and did that? How did we go from desegregation now to resegregation?

How did we go from pleas to be safe, to be healthy from a virus, to now, let's experiment on children? Every child must be given a defective experimental vaccine, even though children are not vulnerable to the virus. And the longer we investigate the vaccine, we're realizing it has trouble. There are issues with it. Not to say that it may have saved lives, it probably did, but it also has problems and children are not vulnerable to Coronavirus. The death rate among children who don't have comorbidities is zero when it comes to Covid, yet our government is saying that every child needs to take this new experimental vaccine. How did we go to this position?
How did we go from respecting the supreme court because of its 1973 Roe decision to now tearing down the Supreme Court because its 2022 decision may overturn Roe? How did we get here?

Well, I think these extremes can be summed up in one word, and that is the word rebellion. This is not mere disagreement about debatable issues, but this is rebellion against God and his moral law, which we call conscience. It's expressed in conscience. We have a moral law written on our hearts, we know basic right and wrong, and when we actually suppress that moral law, in order to do what we want, that is what we call rebellion. Now, when you suppress your conscience, when you rebel against your conscience and try and hold down the truth, it takes a lot of work. Because when you hold down your conscience, it doesn't get more docile, it gets more violent. It would be like trying to hold down the head of a lion. If you hold down the head of a lion, it will not get more docile, it will get more violent. Because your conscience is strong. And I'll explain why this happens a little bit later in the program.

But let me point out what we do to try and hold down our consciences. What do we do? Well, what we do is we take aspects of our conscience, good moral principles, and we wrench them out of context to make a bad thing we want to do actually seem good. In other words, we will cover up evil with moral sounding terms. Terms like choice, equality, justice, love, tolerance, fairness. Who couldn't be for these things, right? Who couldn't be for quality, choice, justice, love, tolerance, fairness? We're all for these things generally but we have to put them in the right context. These, in context, are moral goods, but they are deceptions when they are wrenched out of context and used to excuse, rationalize, or give cover to evil.

In fact, J. Budziszewski, who wrote a book called The Revenge of Conscience: Politics and the Fall of Man. J is a philosophy professor at UT Austin, and he says this idea of trying to rationalize evil with good, he says it's really this, it's moral errors that are covered with opiates. Moral errors covered with opiates. And I'll explain a little bit more of that later in the program, what he's saying here. But that's what we tend to do. You see our conscience won't allow us to say what we're doing is evil. We always want to rationalize any evil we are doing. And by the way, we all do this, not just non-believers. Christians do this. We want to rationalize our evil by somehow spinning it and calling it good.
So, how do we do that and what can we do about it? That's what we're going to talk about here. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is CrossExamined.org. Don't go anywhere. We're back in just two minutes. See you then.

Okay ladies and gentlemen, next week I'll be down in Puerto Rico speaking at a couple of churches down there. So, if we have any listeners from Puerto Rico, I hope to see you next weekend, May 14-15. Go to our website for the details. And I hope to see you down there in the tropical paradise known as Puerto Rico. Also want to mention we are going back to Israel in September. The vaccine mandate is over so we can go. The great Eli Shukron will be our guide. Eli, as you know, or may not know, is a real archaeologist in Israel. He's the guy that discovered the Pool of Siloam where Jesus healed the blind man. He also excavated most of the City of David. And he can take us to places that other guides can't take us. He literally has the keys to some of these places. So, you're going to want to be a part of that if you want to get to Israel.

We're going to take only one bus; it'll be an intimate trip. I've done trips with two buses. I don't like it. I want a smaller group so we can all stay together and enjoy one another and see all the great sites in Israel. Check our website out, click on Events and you'll see the link there. Sign up, because once the bus is full, we're done. We can't take anybody else. So, it's gonna be September 14-24. There's a pre-trip where we go to the Dead Sea and just relax for a couple of days. Because when you go all the way overseas, you get jet lagged and you want to relax before you really go and walk where Jesus walked. Actually, that's not true. You don't walk where Jesus walked, you run where Jesus walked, because you want to see so much. And we do see a lot on this trip. Check it out.

Alright, let's go back to what we're talking about. We're talking about: Why have people taken such mad positions on some things, it seems, in recent years? And the real answer is because people are suppressing their consciences. And as I say, we'll explain this as the program unfolds here. We were talking about, just before the break, how all of us, even when we don't have mad positions, just when we sin, we tend to cover up our evil. We cover up our sins with moral sounding terms like choice, equality, justice, love, tolerance, fairness. Well, look ladies and gentlemen, tolerance is not a virtue without a context. Tolerance is only a virtue when you correctly discern what should be tolerated. It's not a virtue, for example, to tolerate murder.
Choice is not a virtue without a context. Choice is only a virtue when you correctly discern what should be chosen. It's not a virtue to choose murder. So, you've got to put these things in context.

And by the way, when you use rationalizations, words like choice, equality, justice, love, tolerance, fairness, you are appealing to the moral law, the natural law, the Tao, as CS Lewis called it in his book Abolition of Man. In other words, you're appealing to a standard outside yourself and when you appeal to such moral concepts, you're admitting that there's a real right and wrong. But you are taking aspects of that standard, aspects like choice, equality, justice, love, tolerance, fairness, and you are sometimes wrenching them out of context in order to validate or approve your position.

Now ladies and gentlemen, why rationalize if there is no right or wrong? In fact, you wouldn't rationalize some evil you wanted to do if there was no right or wrong, if there was no standard. You wouldn't make excuses for doing wrong if there was no standard. But that's what we do, we make excuses. We say, Well, you know, why was I late? Well, because there was too much traffic, even though there wasn't, right. Why was I late? Well, somebody needed to talk to me, and I had to talk to them, even when you could have put off that conversation to another time right. Why didn't you call me when you should have? Oh, I just got tied up. I got busy. I forgot. When really you were searching the internet and you just blew the person off. Right? I mean, we can come up with every rationalization we can in order to cover ourselves, to put a little opiate on ourselves to make it seem like we were really doing right, even though it was a wrong.

Why did I have an abortion? Well, you know, I just couldn't have a baby then, and the baby would have been brought up in a poor environment without a father, and you know.. So, you're trying to rationalize something that is wrong. But ladies and gentlemen, if there is a real right and wrong, how is it ever right to demand a dead baby? How is that right? Now, I understand that there's a fallopian tube pregnancy, okay. The baby's not gonna live anyway. But in every other case, how is it ever right to demand a dead baby? Because you see right now, people are really going to extremes because they think Roe v. Wade might actually be overturned. And it seems like their reaction and some of the things they're saying, even to the point of going to violence, betrays something. What does it betray?
Well, let’s go to CS Lewis, and then we'll go to J. Budziszewski, because they all have wisdom in this area. And then of course, the ultimate wisdom is the apostle Paul. But here’s what CS Lewis said in his book, Abolition of Man. And this book really points out that there is an objective standard of right and wrong, regardless of the culture you're in. Cultures have disagreed over some issues on the periphery, but they all agree on the essentials. And that's what that book Abolition of Man does.

And here's a section of Abolition of Man that I want us to take a look at. Here's what Lewis says, The Tao, which others may call natural law, or traditional morality, or the first principles of practical reason, or the first platitudes. Or what Thomas Jefferson might call self-evident in the Declaration of Independence. I'm adding this now. Or what the Apostle Paul says the law written on their heart. This is not what Lewis is saying this, what I'm saying. Anyway, these are different ways of saying the same thing. There's a moral standard out there.

And here's what Lewis says, This natural law is not one among a series of possible systems of value. It is the sole source of all value judgments. If it is rejected, all value is rejected. If any value is retained, it is retained. The effort to refute it and raise a new system of value in its place is self-contradictory. There has never been and never will be a radically new judgment of value in the history of the world. What purport to be new systems, or ideologies, all consist of fragments of the Tao itself, arbitrarily wrenched from their context in the hole and then...here's the key phrase...swollen to madness in their isolation, yet still owing to the Tao, and to it alone, such validity as they possess.

Okay, let's translate this. What's Lewis essentially saying here? He's saying that when you take a good thing and wrench it from its context - to somehow say, this is the one thing that we have to worship, this is the one moral principle that we all need to follow - and we take it out of context, that principle, whatever it is, it might be choice, it might be equality, it might even be justice, or tolerance, or fairness. When we swell that, and we wrench it out of context, it becomes swollen to madness in isolation. And that's why you see people actually holding the super extreme positions that we mentioned earlier.

For example, choice. Oh, I have a right to choose my own body. Well, that means I have a right to a dead baby. And not only do I have a right to a dead baby, I'm going to celebrate this dead
baby and I want other people to celebrate it too. In fact, I even want to have the option of having a dead baby, even up to 28 days after this baby is born. It's swollen to madness and isolation. Choice is not a virtue unless it's put in the proper context. And Lewis is saying, when you take that out of context, it can be swollen to madness. So, you're putting it above everything else. Sex is a wonderful thing. Obviously. God created it. But when you make it the end all moral position, the end all value, that you think everybody has to have your view of sex, then you're going to say things like: Three to five year olds, if they think they're the opposite sex, you got to affirm it. Because you see, sex is the ultimate value. Personal identity, whatever that is, is the ultimate value.

That's what's going on here. It's swollen to madness in isolation. People can't tolerate the fact that we're not going to teach kindergarteners through third grade in Florida, we're not going to teach them about sex. Oh, you're wicked. You're a fascist if you think that. How do people get to this conclusion? Because they've taken one good thing out of context, and they've swollen it to madness in isolation.

Now, when you suppress your conscience, when you rebel against your conscience and try and hold it down, as we said earlier, your conscience doesn't get more docile, it gets more violent. And this is what J. Budziszewski points out in his book, The Revenge of Conscience. Before I get to The Revenge of Conscience, I got to point this out. When Lewis says this, If the Tao, or the natural law is rejected, all value is rejected with it. So, for example, if you're going to try and say that choice is a good thing, and it is generally in the right context, you're actually appealing to a natural law in order to say that. But you might then be violating the natural law by saying, I have the right to a dead baby, because my choice is so supreme, that the baby doesn't matter up against my choice.

You see, you're using a fragment of the natural law choice, which is generally a good thing in the right context, you're using that natural law on one hand, but then you're denying the natural law that a baby has the right to live on the other. So, anytime you try and come up with a new system of morality, or a new system of right and wrong, you have to steal from God in order to do it. That goes back to our book Stealing from God. You just can't make up your own value system, because if it's just your own value system, why should anybody else believe it? But if it's grounded in the nature of God, and it really is the way things ought to be, then you
ought to obey the natural law and not take things out of context, not put them in the wrong order.

Generally, when it comes to ethics, when it comes to morality, our first duty is to God, our second duty is to people, and our third duty is to things. And then of course, there's some complexities within that hierarchy. But when we say our own personal choice, our own personal autonomy, is higher than the life of another human being, we're getting things in the wrong order and our position becomes swollen to madness in isolation. What can we do about this? We're going to talk about it right after the break. You're listening to me Frank Turek. Our website is CrossExamined.org We're back in two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

Welcome back to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Athiest with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. We're talking about why there are such extreme positions that people have today, particularly out there on social media, particularly with regard to politics. Where does this come from? It comes from what is known as the revenge of conscience. This is a book that J. Budziszewski wrote back in 1999, the title is, The Revenge of Conscience: Politics and the Fall of Man. And Budziszewski points out that we do in our hearts no right and wrong. He says, We do no better, we are not doing the best we can. The problem of moral decline is volitional, not cognitive. It has little to do with knowledge. He says, By and large, we do know right from wrong, but we wish we did not. We only make believe we are searching for truth so that when we do wrong, condone wrong, or suppress our remorse for having done wrong in the past, he says, we are not untutored but in denial. We do not lack moral knowledge; we hold it down.

And he goes on to say, when you hold down a lion or a wildcat, it doesn't get more docile, it gets more violent. That's why you see these extreme reactions to Roe v Wade being overturned, or gender ideology, or police reform, or you can go on and on and on. Here's what Budziszewski says. Again, I'm reading from his book, The Revenge of Conscience. He says, The need to atone - in other words if we've done wrong, we, in our deep conscience have to atone for what we've done - arises from the knowledge of a debt that must somehow be paid. One would think such knowledge would always lead directly to repentance but the counselors whom I have interviewed tell a different story.
One woman learned during her pregnancy that her husband had been unfaithful to her. She wanted the child, so to punish him for a betrayal, she had an abortion. The trauma of killing was even greater than the trauma of his treachery because this time she was to blame. What was her response? She aborted the next child too. In her words, here’s what she said. "I wanted to be able to hate myself more for what I had did to the first baby". By trying to atone without repenting, she was driven to repeat the sin.

Then Budziszewski goes on to say, The need for reconciliation arises from the fact that guilt cuts us off from God and man. Without repentance, intimacy must be simulated precisely by sharing with others in the guilty act. And then he goes on to tell a story about euthanasia, and then abortion, that people who do these things have to get with other people who have done them in order to feel reconciled somehow. To atone for what they’ve done and feel reconciled. He goes on to say this. The need for reconciliation - and this will explain why we have these public movements, to a certain extent - the need for reconciliation has a public dimension too. Isolated from the community of moral judgment, transgressors strive to gather a substitute around themselves. They do not sin privately. They recruit. The more ambitious among them go further. Refusing to go to the mountain, they require the mountain to come to them. Society must be transformed so that it no longer stands in awful judgment. So, it is that they can change the laws, infiltrate the schools, and create intrusive social welfare bureaucracies.

I remind you; he wrote this in 1999. He's saying these political movements that are built around a sin, whether it's abortion or sexual sin, they have to get validation, they have to atone, they have to get reconciliation.. If they’re not going to repent of those things, they have to get people around them who are going to affirm what they've done, because they've done it too. And they have to tear down any moral judgment from society in order to feel better about themselves. In fact, Budziszewski puts it this way, Rationalization is so much work that they require other people to support them in it. Other people need to be supported through this rationalization, through this reconciliation, through this so-called atonement.

In fact, he tells another story toward the back of the book. He says, one of the best ways to get people to realize this is to ask them some questions. And he says, for example, Most abortion minded women pretend to themselves that they are boxed in by circumstances. They say things like, I know abortion is wrong, but I just can't have a baby right now. One counselor I know, says
Budziszewski, simply asked: What do you call what's in you? Unless thoroughly drilled, hardly anyone calls it a fetus? By the way, fetus actually means a child in the womb, but yeah, it doesn't have the same ring as baby. Anyway. He says, Unless thoroughly drilled, hardly anyone calls it a fetus. No matter what her conscious views about abortion, almost every pregnant woman instinctively replies, I call it a baby. But then my counselor friend can say without offense, then it sounds like you already have a baby. The question isn't whether or not you have one, but what you're going to do with the one you've got.

Look, Budziszewski's right. We all know right from wrong. That's why we make excuses and try and atone for right and wrong or atone for the wrong we've done. And if we're not going to repent, what we need to do is get all of society to repent of them thinking what we've done is wrong. Look, either there is an objective standard of goodness, of rightness, or there isn't. If there is an objective standard, and we all know there is, then we must discover what those rights and wrongs are. If there is not an objective standard, then nothing is ultimately right or wrong, and there are no human rights.

Look, if God doesn't exist, there's not only no right to life, there's no right to an abortion. Why? Because there's no right to anything. Everything's just a matter of opinion, as we said many times on this program. In fact, if there is no God, you have no grounds by which to protest anything, because since no objective standard exists, no objective standard has been violated. You can't say that Supreme Court is right or wrong about anything if there is no standard. Now, of course, in our country, the standard is the constitution. Now, the standard of the Constitution, any reasonable person who looks at the Constitution, even many liberals realize, Roe versus Wade had nothing to do with the Constitution because there is nothing in the Constitution about abortion. There's nothing in the Constitution about a baby. There's nothing in the Constitution about viability or any of these kind of kind of arbitrary standards they put into their decision, Roe versus Wade.

This is why the draft opinion, supposedly by Alito, says that Roe versus Wade was wrong from the beginning. Of course, it's been wrong. There's nothing in the Constitution about abortion. If you want a right to abortion in the Constitution, you need to go through the amendment process. That's why the amendment process is there ladies and gentlemen. You've got to convince your fellow citizens, state by state, to put a new amendment in the Constitution. You...
just can't have unelected justices come along and say, Oh, we're going to overturn the will of the people in all 50 states. They want to have laws against abortion, we're gonna say, no, you have a right to an abortion.

And by the way, all Roe does is, it goes back to the pre-1973 situation where every state decided what their abortion laws would be. In other words, it puts the power back in the hands of the people, rather than the court. And that's the way it should have been from the beginning. Some have argued that abortion should not be allowed anywhere, due to the Constitution, because of the 14th Amendment, the due process clause there. That you're not giving baby's due process. Others will argue, well, when they passed the 14th Amendment, they weren't considering babies in the womb as being persons. Well, we can argue that. But I obviously think that people have a right to life from the moment of conception, because that is a human being from the moment of conception. Whether the Constitution affirms that right at the moment of conception is another story. But at least now, we have at least the capacity to restrict abortion, or ban abortion, state by state. And that's what if this goes through, and it should, because it's good law, that's what's going to happen. It's going to go state by state.

So, if you're going to say there is no standard, you have no right to protest anything. In fact, you have no grounds to claim anyone has been treated unjustly, if there is no God, if there is no standard, because since no standard of justice exists, no injustice has ever been done. This is why Lewis says that if you're going to claim that you have this right to anything, or you have this new moral ideology, you have to steal it from God's nature in order to make it work. You have to borrow other moral precepts in order to make your moral precept work. You have to assume a standard in order to create a new standard.

Now look, either humans have a nature and a value, or they do not. If humans have a nature and a value then we discover how they should be treated and what limits they should put on their own behavior. If human beings do not have a nature of value then anything goes. More powerful humans can use the weaker humans for their own benefit. That's where we are. Look, you're gonna govern people on principle, you're gonna govern people purely by power. That's why we see many people from the left, they don't care about principle, it's all about power. If the Supreme Court doesn't see it our way, we're going to leak... Well, I can't say this at this point. We don't know who leaked it, but it sure seems it was probably somebody from the left.
If it was somebody from the left, then they're trying to say, We don't care about the process, we don't care about the rule of law, we just want the end the ends justify the means. So, we're gonna use power to usurp the truth. That's dangerous ladies and gentlemen. There are no rights without God. No rights at all.

Now, you might say, Well, I'm neutral. If you say I'm neutral, you'll wind up giving moral justifications for your neutrality, which isn't neutrality at all. You know, if you say you're neutral on abortion, if you if you wind up saying a woman has the right to control her own body, so who am I to say she can't, that's actually a moral position itself. That's not neutral. You see, you're appealing to a moral standard to say, I'm going to be morally neutral. It presupposes that in the name of controlling her body, a woman has a moral right to kill someone else. She has a moral right to a dead baby. Ladies and gentlemen, can we be honest? Does any mother or any human being have the moral right to a dead baby?

And by the way, the pro-choice position is not neutral. It assumes the baby is not a baby. That's not a neutral position. It assumes the baby doesn't have a right to life. It assumes that the father or the state has no right to keep that baby alive. After all, it doesn't give the baby, the father, or the state a choice. It assumes all this; it doesn't prove it. You have to steal a standard in order to come up with your own standard, which is wrenched out of context.

Alright, a lot more after the break. You're listening to Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. The podcast is called I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. Back in two.

Ladies and gentlemen, this week our brand new book, a book I wrote with my son, called Hollywood Heroes: How Your Favorite Movies Reveal God, just released this past Tuesday. We were going to do a program on it. We did one last week. We'll do another program here in the future. But we thought this was timelier at this point to talk about this Roe v Wade issue and talk about these extreme positions people are taking. So, we'll get to it in the future. But if you want to learn more about it, go to HollywoodHeroesBook.com.

And those you have gotten the book, thank you. If you would, only if you like the book, put a nice review up on Amazon or wherever you get books. That will help more people see it. And it again, it's a book that I think is a timely book because there are so many different venues out
there trying to get to your children, so many different movies, so many different places they can see things. Why not use some of the things they're already watching as a segue to the gospel and as a segue to good biblical life lessons? And you'd be surprised how many biblical life lessons you can get from some of these superhero movies, whether we're talking about Captain America, Iron Man, Star Wars, Lord of the Rings, Batman, Wonder Woman. We cover all this in the book, Hollywood Heroes. So, check it out. And we'll talk about it more in a future program.

Alright, let's talk about now what the Apostle Paul has said about all this. And there's no more relevant passage as to how we suppress the truth in unrighteousness, and how we know what the truth is, and why we get these extreme positions in public life now, then Romans chapter one, particularly verses 18 and following. Here's what the Apostle says to the biggest church at the time in his day. He says, "18 The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of people, who suppress the truth by their wickedness, 19 since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. 20 For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that people are without excuse."

Basically, he's saying, Look, everyone knows there's a God. Everyone knows there's a God by creation and design and also through conscience. He talks about that more in Romans chapter two. But this is why we know there's a God because we are reasoning from effect to cause. We know God by his effect. So, if there is a creation, and we all know there is a creation, that's the effect, we have to reason back to a cause, a creator. If there's design in the world, and there is, that's the effect, we have to reason back to a cause, a designer. If there's a moral law written on our hearts, that's the effect, we have to reason back to a cause, a moral law giver. If we have the ability to reason itself, which is an effect, we should reason back to a cause, a mind.

In fact, our minds are made in the image of the great mind. That's why we can think, that's why we can ascertain truths about the real world. So, when anyone asks you: How do you know God exists?, one way you ought to say is, I know God by His effects. I'm reasoning from effect to cause. That's what scientists do. And what Paul was saying here in Romans chapter one is these invisible qualities, God's eternal power and divine nature are clearly seen, but you might
suppress those things to go your own way. You suppress them, you suppress the truth by your wickedness. You want to do something, and so you're suppressing the truth about it so you can do it.

And by the way, unbelievers know the truth about these things. Whether you're a believer or not, you know basic right and wrong. In order to suppress the truth, you have to have it. Here's what Paul says continuing in verse 21. "21 For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks..." Alright, I don't know about you ladies and gentlemen, but there's no way to be happy unless you're thankful. There's no way to be happy unless you're grateful. There's no way to be happy unless you appreciate the good things you have. And I see so many people, particularly in the public square, screaming and yelling and canceling other people. They're not happy, they're not giving thanks, they're just perpetually bitter, perpetually mad. They're perpetually sucking on a lemon. Nothing's ever good. All we can do is scream and howl at the moon. You're never going to be happy if you don't give thanks to God.

Paul says, "21 ...but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. 22 Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools 23 and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like a mortal human being and birds and animals and reptiles." In other words, they have idols. And Christians, this can affect us too. We can have idols. We can have good things that are idols. We put them before God. They can be our family, our job, they can be our relationships, they can be money, they can be power. We can put things above God too and suppress the truth about them.

Here's what Paul continues to say in verse 24. "24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another. 25 They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen. 26 Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural sexual relations for unnatural ones. 27 In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed shameful acts with other men and received in themselves the due penalty for their error."
I know some have tried to make the case, well homosexual behavior isn't bad, or homosexual orientation isn't the problem. And Paul didn't know about homosexual orientation. If he did, he would have approved homosexual relations. Well, here Paul is saying the acts themselves, the behavior itself is the problem. Not the person with the orientation. He's not even making that case. He's saying the acts are the problem. So, regardless of what orientation one has, it's the acts, it's not the orientation. So, Romans chapter one doesn't give any wiggle room for people that believe the Bible is true to say that homosexual acts are affirmed, although some people try and make the case. It doesn't work. He's calling the acts shameful.

Paul goes on to say, "28 Furthermore, just as they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, so God gave them over to a depraved mind, so that they do what ought not to be done." Okay, here's where we get to the point where people are cheering others on. They have to come together, as Budziszewski said earlier, they have to come together and reconcile... If they're not going to repent, they got to reconcile with one another. They gotta find other people who have done the same thing and who will affirm what they've done is okay. I mean, I know this is very psychological but that's what Paul was talking about here, too, that this is what the psyche does. If you're not going to repent of what you've done, you've got to justify what you've done. You've got to rationalize what you've done, and you've got to find other people who will support you in that, other people who have done the same thing.

Here's what Paul says. "29 They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips, slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents; 31 they have no understanding, no fidelity, no love, no mercy." Gee, isn't that the cancel culture right there? There's no love. There's no mercy. They're gossips. They're slanderers. They're God haters. If you think human beings are essentially good, just go read any Twitter feed. Just go read the comments in Twitter. Just go read the comments in a YouTube video. People are vile. They're not seeking what's good. They're trying to tear everything down.

And unfortunately, many Christians have done this too. If you're online and you're slandering people, you're tearing people down, even if they disagree with you, you ought not be doing that. You ought to deal with the argument. You ought not throw mud at the person. Deal with
the argument. The person is made in the image of God, even if they have a completely different theological or political position than you have.

Paul concludes it this way, "32 Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them." They're cheering other people on. This is exactly why we see these extreme positions, positions that have lost any semblance of rationality. We've gone from safe, legal, and rare - which is still irrational, because why would you want it rare if there was nothing wrong with it? - to now we're going to celebrate this, we're going to shout it. In fact, we're going to make it legal right up to the moment of birth and even after birth. This is not rational. This is madness. They've taken a good thing out of context. They've wrenched it out of context, as Lewis put it. They've suppressed the truth about what they really ought to do. They've wrenched a good thing out of context, and it's been swollen to madness in isolation.

Sex is the new religion ladies and gentlemen. This is why the Bible warns against it, warns against illicit sex, not against proper sex. Sex is wonderful and necessary in its proper context. Take anything out of context, it can become evil and problematic. So, this is why you've got people saying that three to five year olds have to be affirmed if they think... Three to five? You don't even know anything at that point. You can hardly talk. And yet we have our government telling us, Oh, no, you got to affirm them in this gender dysphoria. Despite the fact that, even kids with gender dysphoria, more than 80% of them grow out of it by the time they're 18. It's socially constructed ladies and gentlemen. That's why there's a 4,000% increase in this. It's even more than that in some areas. Ten years ago, you didn't have all this gender dysphoria. Now it's everywhere. Why? It's social media. It's social contagion.

Now, you've got people who can't even tell you what a woman is. This is madness. You got people who say, Hey, the police need to be reformed. Okay, if they do, let's reform them. But defund the police? Madness. Absolutely madness. You want chaos? Get rid of government. This is why the chief architect of our Constitution, James Madison said, If men were angels, no government would be necessary. Yeah, you want anarchy then defund the police. That's going to be madness. There's so much mad in this ladies and gentlemen, but now you know why. Because our conscience is screaming at us. And either we're going to repent and stop doing the
evil we've done, or we're going to try and double down and get others to agree with us. And that's why you see these things swollen to madness in isolation.

Alright, pray for everyone ladies and gentlemen. Pray that we can come back to rationality and morality in this country. And do that yourselves if you would. Come back to morality. Live a life of love and justice and peace. We'll see you back here next week. God bless.