

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

There is No Right to A Dead Baby with Frank Turek

(July 1, 2022)

After 63 million dead, the Supreme Court finally overturned Roe vs. Wade. So, do you have a constitutional right to a dead baby? Finally, the court has answered properly, No. We're going to unpack it today. We're going to deal with a number of questions. Number one, what did the Supreme Court actually do? And what didn't it do? And what does the Constitution say? Secondly, what does the decision tell us about the importance of voting for pro-life presidents? On this show, every election cycle, we've been bringing this up. What does this decision tell us? Number three, have Christians set up a theocracy? I hear rant after rant, But we're in a theocracy now. This is separation of church and state. Can't do this. And what about the people who say, Well, it's my body my choice? Then we're going to also talk about, now that we have to really make the case for life - because until now, the Supreme Court has sort of made this a moot point politically. But now we're going to actually have to make the case for life. How do we do that? Oh, and what would Satan actually say about the Supreme Court decision? What would he say?

Well, our friends over at the Babylon Bee had their microphones in Satan's press conference last week after Roe v. Wade went down. We'll hear that, so get ready for all that during this program ladies and gentlemen. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. This is also a podcast called I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist.

Well, a lot of prayer for the past 49 years has finally paid off in a big way. A lot of hard work, a lot of people out there, and many of them have been you, have been praying and working hard for this day to come. But our work is just beginning, ladies and gentlemen, because now that the decision goes back to the States, as to whether or not abortion should be legal in each individual state and to what extent should it be legal, we're going to have to now make the case. Politicians and citizens on both sides of this issue can no longer hide behind the excuse, Well, the life issue really doesn't matter because the Supreme Court has tied our hands.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Well, ladies and gentlemen, they just untied them, and they untied them rightfully. You now must make your case for your position, whether you consider abortion something that should be right, or whether you think the pro-life position is correct. And it shouldn't be a right. Now you got to make a case. So, get ready. It's a good time to be alive because we need to make our case.

Now, first of all, let's deal with the Constitution. Let's look at what the Constitution actually says about this issue. And there's no better place to go than the Constitution itself, because as you know, it says nothing about abortion. It says nothing about trimesters. It says nothing about viability. It says nothing about all these things that the Roe v Wade case somehow made up out of thin air that the Constitution talked about these things. The truth of the matter is, ladies and gentlemen, abortion is not in the Constitution and was never in the Constitution. And Justice Alito's brilliantly argued case points this out. I'm just going to read a couple of paragraphs from it. Something that apparently the left, the people that want abortion to stay legal, they won't even read. But this is irrefutable what Alito says.

Here is what Alito says in a paragraph in the opinion titled: The Nature of the Court's Error. He says this. "Like the infamous decision in Plessy versus Ferguson"... Okay, you got to stop already. What is Plessy versus Ferguson? It was the Supreme Court case that talked about separate but equal. It actually advanced racism, it advanced segregation, and that was overturned by Brown versus Board of Education in the 1950s. So, Plessy versus Ferguson was a precedent that was overturned by Brown versus Board of Education. Okay. You got that down. Okay.

[You can find the link to the opinion at
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/interactive/2022/dobbs-alito-draft-annotated/>]

So, Alito says this [summary, not direct quote]. Like the infamous decision in Plessy versus Ferguson, Roe was also egregiously wrong and on a collision course with the Constitution from the day it was decided. Casey, which is a case that came after Roe... And I'll tell you about that a little bit later because I was actually at the Supreme Court when the Casey decision came down in 1992. But I'll get to that later. Here it says, Casey perpetuated Roe's errors. This is Alito writing in his majority opinion. Calling both sides of the national controversy to resolve their

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

debate, but in doing so, Casey necessarily declared a winning side. Those on the losing side, those who sought to advance the state's interest in fetal life, could no longer seek to persuade their elected representatives to adopt policies consistent with their views. The court short circuited the democratic process by closing it to the large number of Americans who disagreed with Roe.

Justice Alito goes on in another paragraph about the quality of the reasoning. And this really gets to the heart of why Roe v Wade was just legislation, it wasn't really a judicial opinion that stayed close to the language and intent of the Constitution. It just legislated from the bench. Here's what Alito says. Without any grounding in the constitutional text, history, or precedent, Roe imposed on the entire country a detailed set of rules for pregnancy divided into trimesters, much like those that one might find in a statute or regulation. Roe's failure even to note the overwhelming consensus of state laws in effect in 1868 is striking.

Let me stop right here. Why 1868? Because the Roe and Casey courts, particularly the Casey court, looked at the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution as somehow granting the right to an abortion. Even though the 1868 14th Amendment talks about the right to life, and abortion is nowhere in there. They tried to look at the 1868 case to say, Well, somehow in here, there's a right to an abortion. So, Alito says, Roe's failure, even to note the overwhelming consensus of state laws in effect in 1868 is striking, and what it said about the common law was simply wrong. He goes on to say, These are precisely the sort of considerations that legislative bodies often take into account when they draw lines that accommodate competing interests. This scheme Roe produced look like legislation and the court provided the sort of explanation that might be expected from a legislative body.

Well, he's exactly right. The Roe court, and later the Casey court, those two decisions were pretty much just legislation. And that's not what the court is supposed to do. The court is supposed to take existing legislation, written by you through your elected representatives in Congress and the president, they are supposed to take the legislation that has been passed, compare it to the Constitution and see if it's constitutional. They're not supposed to write their own legislation, but that's exactly what Roe versus Wade did. And that's exactly what the Casey decision, Casey v Planned Parenthood, did. In other words, the original Roe v Wade decision was political. It was the court acting like a legislature.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now, if you want the constitution to have a right to an abortion, you can make it have a right to an abortion by going through the amendment process. You got to convince the United States Congress, and the President, and the states - I think three quarters of the states - to put an amendment in the Constitution for a right to an abortion. You just can't have you know, seven unelected, or even five unelected justices say, Well, we're just gonna write our own legislation and say it's in the Constitution. It's not there. When they do that they're taking the rights of the people to govern themselves away from us. That's why you can't legislate from the bench. We're not governed by unelected justices. We're supposed to be governing ourselves to our elected representatives, and when a court goes beyond that, it's taking that right away from us. Alright, a lot more on this. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek. We're back in two minutes.

Are you looking for NPR, National Public Radio, as you're dialing below 92 FM? Don't go any further. You're never going to hear this on NPR. We're actually going to tell you the truth. That's our intent anyway. 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.

I want to mention that we're going back to Israel this September and our guide is the great Eli Shukron, the Israeli archaeologist who discovered the Pool of Siloam and excavated most of the City of David. He's going to be our guide and we're going to have a blast. It's a VIP tour; we're staying in the best hotels, going into the best places, going to places that only Ellie can get you into, so you're not going to want to miss it. It's in mid-September. Check out our website, CrossExamined.org, click on Events, you'll see it there. I don't like huge trips to Israel. It's just going to be us on one bus and we're going to have a great time. I hope you can join us. Check it out before it fills up. You'd better sign up soon because we've just got a few seats left. This going to be a trip that I've been looking forward to for a while because now with all the vaccine mandates, and all the testing, and all that's gone, you don't have to have that anymore, now we can go back to Israel. I haven't been there, I don't think, since 2018, so I'm looking forward to going back. I hope to see you with us.

We're talking the Roe v Wade decision overturned by the Dobbs decision. And we were just talking about how both Roe v Wade and its next case that affirmed Roe v Wade, Casey versus Planned Parenthood, those weren't decided properly. That was legislation from the bench, the

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Roe v Wade decision and the Casey decision, and Alito is pointing that out in his opinion. In fact, I know there are people out there saying, particularly the media, Oh, the Supreme Court has taken away the constitutional right to an abortion. No, they're not taking away any right. There never was a right to an abortion in the Constitution. They're just correcting the error they made in the Roe v Wade decision and the Casey decision.

I mean, to give you an analogy, imagine the pastor of your church declaring that the Bible says that you have a right to murder people who annoy you on social media. Would that mean the Bible actually says that? No. We know the Bible doesn't say that. In fact, social media is not mentioned anywhere in the Bible. Obviously, there was no social media during the Bible times, and we know that the Bible also explicitly prohibits murder elsewhere. So, if your pastor came along and said - just as an illustration - Oh, yeah, the Bible says you can murder people who annoy you on social media. That wouldn't mean the Bible actually says that. I mean, if a new pastor showed up and corrected the error of the first pastor, would you have any grounds to claim that the new pastor has taken away your biblical right to murder people who annoy you on social media? No, of course not. The new pastor is merely correcting the grave error of the first pastor.

The same is true with the Dobbs decision. It's correcting the grave error of the Roe and Casey decisions. The Constitution doesn't mention abortion. It's silent on it. Now, the Constitution does say that no one can be deprived of life or liberty without due process. That is the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution. And that amendment, as you know, was designed to ensure that people who were previously slaves were not denied their rights. But the Supreme Court did not say that that particular amendment, the 14th Amendment when it says you can't be deprived of life without due process, they did not say that that clause applies to unborn children. The court merely said that abortion is for state governments to decide.

So, the court didn't go as far as it could have gone. It could have said, Well, the 14th Amendment says that everyone has a right to life and an unborn child is a living human being therefore, there is a constitutional right to life and that would have outlawed abortion. That's not what this decision has done. That decision actually just throws the question back to the state governments. So, this Dobbs decision was a very reserved decision. It could have gone further. Now, obviously, I believe, I think it's true, that unborn children do have a right to life.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

The question is: Does the Constitution say that? And I remember Justice Antonin Scalia saying that when the 14th Amendment was passed, they were passing that amendment to apply to born people, to people already walking around. That's the way Scalia put it and he's probably right about that. It probably would have been a bit of judicial activism for the court to say the 14th Amendment protects unborn children and their right to life.

Now, don't get me wrong, I think the Constitution should say that, but if I want the Constitution to say that, I've got to go through the amendment process. Just like somebody who wants abortion to be part of the Constitution, they have to go through the amendment process. Otherwise, we have judicial activism. No matter what side you're on, if you want the Constitution to talk about abortion, you've got to go through the amendment process.

Now, by the way, interpreting and applying the Constitution shouldn't be hard most of the time. It's like looking at the Bible. You have to look at the Bible and figure out: What does the text say? Not what I wanted to say, not my own personal philosophy, or my own personal morality. I've got to figure out: What did the framers mean? Or what did later generations who amended the Constitution, what did they mean by their amendment. If I'm going to be true to the text, if I'm going to be true to the concept that the people have the right to govern themselves, that when people decide to govern themselves and they put their preferences or their political opinions into law, I have to respect what they meant by that, because I want them to respect what this generation means when we put something into law.

Now, hopefully, we're following the natural law, which comes from God. We're not just making up rights, or we're not just deciding what we want to be true. We're putting in the law, what God... And ladies and gentlemen, get over it. Our country was founded on theism. If you don't like that, you can go to a country that doesn't ground its rights in God, and when you do that, then any legislation that comes down is just based on the whims of the rulers. I want to be governed by the truth, not just what somebody hopes they want in law, or what someone prefers they want in law, I want what's in law to be actually true. And this is why our Declaration of Independence says, We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men were created and endowed by their government. No, it doesn't say government endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

In other words, governments don't give you your rights, governments are there to secure rights. And of course, Jefferson and his colleagues said, If a government like King George's government doesn't secure our rights, we have a right to a new government. And that's what the Declaration of Independence from King George was all about. So, I want self-evident truths and other truths from God to be put into law. And we'll get to the separation of church and state here in a minute. But that's the point. We have to respect the law as it is written. If we're just gonna make up our own laws from the bench, then the people are no longer governing ourselves.

In fact, you know what, the dissenting justices were Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan. Here's what they say in the first paragraph of the dissent. For half a century, *Roe v Wade* and *Planned Parenthood of Eastern PA v Casey*, have protected the liberty and equality of women. *Roe* held, and *Casey* reaffirmed, that the Constitution safeguards a woman's right to decide for herself whether to bear child. *Roe* held, and *Casey* reaffirmed, that in the first stages of pregnancy... Notice they're falling right into Alito's trap. What was Alito saying? The Constitution doesn't talk about pregnancy, doesn't talk about stages of pregnancy, doesn't talk about trimesters, doesn't talk about abortion, doesn't talk about any of these things, obviously. And yet, the dissent is admitting that that's what *Roe* and *Casey* did. They started talking about things not in the Constitution.

Roe held, and *Casey* reaffirmed, that in the first stages of pregnancy, the government shall not make that choice for women. The government could not control a woman's body or the course of a woman's life. It could not determine what a woman's future would be. Respecting a woman as an autonomous being and granting her full equality meant giving her substantial choice over this most personal and most consequential of all life decisions.

That's not your job court. It's not your job to decide who gets to choose what. Your job is to look at what the Constitution says and apply it to specific cases. It's not for you to decide what the stages of pregnancy are. It's not for you to decide what viability is or even if that's a standard. It's not for you to decide who's an autonomous being and who isn't. It's not for you to decide who has substantial choice and who doesn't. It's not for you to decide any of those things that have already been decided by the legislature viability.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

By the way, Roe tried to come up with the viability standard. That standard is arbitrary anyway. It keeps changing with medical technology. And also, I know some teenagers that aren't viable. If you leave them alone and don't take care of them, they will die. This is just legislation from the bench. And thankfully, it's finally been overturned and now each state government is going to have to decide what they're going to do about it.

And then, by the way, the dissent tries to talk about stare decisis. You know what that's about? That's where they try and say that precedent is supreme. That's what the phrase, stare decisis, means. That we should defer to precedent most of the time. And I think that's a problem. Why? We shouldn't adhere to precedent unless the preceding case, or cases, were properly decided. Judges take an oath to defend the Constitution, not precedent. I mean, to make precedents supreme would be like making commentaries of the Bible supreme over the Bible itself. It would be like never reading the Bible itself but reading commentaries of commentaries and concluding that they are authoritative over your life rather than the Bible.

I mean, imagine going to seminary and studying only commentaries of commentaries of the Bible, but never actually reading the Bible itself. That's what people do when they go to law school now. They read commentaries of commentaries of commentaries on the Constitution, and they don't even really understand or study the Constitution. They're studying what people after people, or person after person, or case after case have said about the Constitution, and that really gets watered down doesn't it. In fact, the Supreme Court has overruled itself over 200 times and they just did it again, thankfully, and we're back with more of that. I'm Frank Turek. Don't go anywhere. We're back in two minutes.

30 years ago, ladies and gentlemen, I was a naval ROTC instructor at George Washington University in Washington, DC, a great job, and the Planned Parenthood v Casey decision came out. And I actually stood in line at the Supreme Court to get that decision because we thought it might overturn Roe v Wade. And of course, it didn't. Thankfully, this Dobbs decision did after millions more have been killed. And this is a famous phrase from the Casey decision. Now, it's hard to believe that a Supreme Court justice actually wrote what I'm about to read to you. But here's what Justice Kennedy wrote. "Some of us as individuals find abortion offensive to our most basic principles of morality, but that cannot control our decision. Our obligation is to define the liberty of all, not to mandate our own moral code. At the heart of liberty is the right

CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life."

Now, Judge Robert Bork, who actually should have been on the court, but was what we call now "borked" by the Democrats in the Senate, and he was not confirmed to the Supreme Court. The guy who replaced him, Justice Kennedy, is the one that wrote those words I just read to you. And here's what Bork said about this phrase "at the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life". Bork wrote, "One would think grown men and women purporting to practice an intellectual profession would themselves choose to die with dignity right in the courtroom before writing sentences like those."

Now, why did he say that? Because this is just radical relativism, the court's decision mandated its own moral code, that a woman has an absolute moral right to kill her child, and it imposed its own moral code on the baby, the father, and the people of the states. That's not a neutral position. Also, by Kennedy's own dicta - and dicta is a word we use to describe his opinion. By Kennedy's own dicta, thieves could be stealing because theft is simply an expression of their own concept of existence. Or races could be discriminating because, as they define the universe, only members of their own race should be treated fairly. Or terrorists could be killing because, by their own definition of the mystery of human life, their victims are not human. I mean, Kennedy's dicta just nullifies all criminal law.

In fact, after that opinion was made, Justice Scalia in his dissent said this. "It is not reasoned judgment that supports the Court's decision in Casey, only personal predilection." Only their personal preferences. And he said, "The Imperial judiciary lives." Yes, exactly. They're just imposing their moral code on everyone. They're just imposing their position on everyone. They're just imposing their political preferences on everyone, rather than applying the political preferences that the people have put through their legislatures, and through legislation, rather than applying those positions to law. The court has just decided, we don't like what the people said, we're going to put our own political opinions. We're going to impose that on everyone.

Now, you may have heard people say, Well, the Constitution is a living document. If it's a living document, ladies and gentlemen, then you don't govern yourself, unelected justices lord over

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

you. You don't govern yourself because judges can invent law. They can make the Constitution say whatever they want. And by the way, a lot of people do that today with the Bible, don't they? They try and make the Bible say whatever they want it to say, for example, progressive Christians. It doesn't say what you want it to say. How are you calling yourself a Christian when you're disagreeing with Jesus? What sense does that make? Alright, but I digress. Let's get back to the Constitution. We've got 63 million unborn children dead because the court decided to put its own political preferences into their opinion, and thereby, they try and make it the law of the land. And it operated as the law of the land, unfortunately, for nearly 50 years, and 63 million unborn children have died, and finally, they've corrected the mistake.

Why would God even allow this? In fact, why does God allow evil at all? That's a question, by the way, that Clay Jones is going to address in a course that begins July 20. Clay Jones, a great professor, originally with Biola, has a number of books on the topic of evil. If you want to be a part of that online course, all you need to do is go to CrossExamined.org and click on Online Courses. And if you take the premium version, you'll have several online zoom sessions for Q&A with Clay. It's a great question: Why does God allow evil? So, check it out in that course.

Now, what about Christians being involved in politics? We're gonna get into that question, but before we do, the Babylon Bee had their microphones at Satan's press conference right after Roe v Wade went down. Let's see what Satan had to say about the Roe v Wade decision. Here he is.

Satan:

I want to thank you all for coming down here today. I hope it's not too hot. You can always turn the thermostat down a couple 1000 degrees if anyone gets uncomfortable. Mmm, this kale flavor is my favorite [drinking]. As you all know, the team and I suffered big defeat this week with the overturning of Roe v Wade. We went out there, we gave it our all with fantastic offensive game, but ultimately the good guys, and Justice Roberts, came in clutch, played a better game. So, let's take some questions. You, you there with the teeth.

Person 1:

Satan, it seemed like you had it in the bag with Roe on lockdown for 50 years. What went wrong out there?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Satan:

Yeah. Thank you for the question. You know, we gotta look on the bright side here. We put up some incredible numbers. Over 60 million PBAs, that's preborn babies aborted, for the layperson. It's an absolute world record. Ah, yeah, I can't take all the credit though. This is a team sport, and we got an incredible team. We got Planned Parenthood, Moloch, Nancy Pelosi, they all made this possible. It didn't go the way that we want it this time, but in the end, still have a championship team of demons, devils, and Democrats out there, and you know, there's always next season.

Person 2:

Excuse me, the devil. What are your plans for the hell franchise going forward?

Satan:

Excellent question. Obviously, this is a rebuilding year for us. We're gonna build back better. And we have some great up and coming prospects. We got Kamala Harris. You've heard her demonic cackle. Of course, it's one of the best in the game. It scares even me sometimes. You know. Of course, we got all the progressive Christians out there. We got the guy from Green Day. We got Pink now. And, of course, the Republicans with the week defensive game. So, thanks Mitch. You know, they let us remain dominant killing babies for over 50 years. And let's not forget we still have we still have California and New York in the bag putting up incredible numbers in the child sacrifice department.

Person 3:

Anything else you can tell us for the fans out there?

Satan:

Well, let's see. While our abortion game will be down for a while, we got some great stuff lined up, so... We're gonna be rolling out another Amy Schumer comedy special. We got an even flimsier paper straw debuting next year. And we're putting more extremely long un-skippable cutscenes in video games. You know, the ones with the seven QT sequences where you gotta mash X or usually die. You have to watch the whole thing again [laughing]. Classic. So, you know, don't count us out. Anyway, gotta make an appearance at a family friendly drag show in

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Texas. No more questions. Okay. This press conference is over. Oh, and Beelzebub, release the beast.

Person 4:

Wait, what?

Person 5:

Beast?

Satan:

There are so many people helped us through the years; Margaret Sanger, Alyssa Milano, shout out to my home girl, Michelle Obama out there, thanks for the support. Let's see, Jen Hatmaker Rachel Hollis, the absolute goat, Kermit Gosnell, pretty much every Hollywood actor, except for that guy who played Frazier. Joe Biden's handlers, all the Republican congressmen who got their mistresses pregnant, and the ladies from My Favorite television show of all time, The View. They do great work. Oh, and Steve.

Frank:

Ladies and gentlemen, those are our brilliant friends at the Babylon Bee. If you want to see that entire video, and I think they got a million views the first day it came out, just go to BabylonBee.com or look them up on YouTube. Absolutely brilliant satire. And they nailed it ladies and gents. Did you hear him say, the goat, Kermit Gosnell? Now that's the guy who was murdering all those babies in Philadelphia. The abortionist who had heads or fetuses frozen in his freezer. I mean, horrific stuff. Anyway, those are our friends at the Babylon Bee. And look for me to be on the Babylon Bee podcast here in July. We just recorded that recently. Just great folks out there. Go to the BabylonBee.com for more.

Now, when the Dobbs decision came out, I tweeted this. "The Supreme Court decision today vindicates every Christian who voted for Trump despite their understandable concerns about some of his personal behavior. Life and death policy, always Trump's personality. Millions of babies will now live because enough people voted policy over personality." Exactly. We've talked about it on this program many times before, that Christians need to vote, and they need to vote certain priorities over other priorities. What could be more of a priority than life? Now,

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

just before the election, there was a video that came out, put out by Phil Vischer who is one of the founders of Veggie Tales. Phil has done some great work in that department. But he put out a video that I thought was atrocious and I wrote about it. And you can read about that video, the make believe Veggie Tales video about abortion. It's on our website.

That video did not age well. Why? Because that video just before the last election, the 2020 election, was trying to convince people that well, Roe v Wade can't be overturned, or if it is it's not going to make much of a difference. You know, there are other more important things and they're basically trying to get you to say you ought to vote. They were trying to get everyone to not vote Republican, not vote life, not vote Trump, vote Biden. And so, I wrote why - and I don't have time to get into all of this - I wrote why that was not the right way of voting. That you have to vote what's most important. You have to not neglect, as Jesus said, the more important matters of the law, justice, mercy, and faithfulness. He said this in Matthew 23:23, to the politicians of his day, the Pharisees. Yes, Jesus got involved in politics. And for too long, we've been inverting our voting priorities. We have to vote the most important issues, not the secondary and tertiary issues.

And I'll unpack that more after the break and then we'll talk about how we can make the case for life. Don't go anywhere. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, here on the American Family Radio Network, with me, Frank Turek. Our website is CrossExamined.org. Don't go anywhere. We're back in two minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have so much to say and so little time to say it. But one place we are trying to say quite a bit and give you the tools you need to have in order to defend the Christian faith and defend life, is on our new CrossExamined Community. We've just developed this. It's behind a paywall that does not have a high price. It's just a paywall that we need to have there so it can be an intimate conversation where you are not going to be doxed. Where you are not going to be seen by people who want to hurt you. Or you're not going to be seen by your employer so he can out you and maybe fire you because you don't share his political views. Where you're not going to be censored for putting up a question or putting up a comment about these very controversial and explosive issues. It's the CrossExamined Community on that community. Our entire team is on that community.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

If you want to be a part of it go to [CrossExamined.org](https://www.CrossExamined.org). Look at the very top of the of the website, you'll see the menu there. Or you can just download the app because there are apps for both Droid and apps for Apple. Just look for CrossExamined Community, download the app, and you can sign up through there. And there's a free trial period, so you can check it out, see if you like it, and then if you like it, you can stay with us. And by the way, we do a Zoom meeting every month for Q&A. I'll be the person answering the questions. When you join the cross examined community there's also a lot of exclusive content, stuff you're not going to get anywhere else. So, check it out.

Alright, let's get back to what we're talking about here. The Roe v Wade decision that has been overturned by the Dobbs decision. And I was talking just before the break about how Christians have to vote according to the weightier matters of the law, as Jesus put it to the politicians of his day. He said in Matthew 23:23-24, "23 'Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You give a tenth of your spices—mint, dill, and cumin. But you have neglected the more important matters of the law—justice, mercy, and faithfulness. You should have practiced the latter, without neglecting the former. 24 You blind guides! You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel.'"

Well, our point here is that you have to vote the top issues and life is the top issue. The right to life is the right to all of the rights. If you don't have life, you don't have anything, so we need to make the case for life. Now, I need to deal with what some of the detractors have said, some of the objectors have said. Well, you can't legislate your religion. What about the separation of church and state? You're taking away my rights. It's my body, my choice. In fact, there's another viral video going around about a very liberal political commentator, a woman saying, I don't care what the Bible says. Stop saying what the Bible says. You don't have your right to impose that on me.

Okay. I get it. When somebody says we ought not impose what the Bible says, or you're setting up a theocracy, you ought to ask that person a couple of questions. Number one: Are you saying we shouldn't have laws against murder and theft? Because you know, those laws are in the Bible. Oh, oh, yeah, they are, aren't they? Do you realize that you're stealing from God when you argue against him, because if you're going to say that you have a right to a certain thing, say a right to an abortion, where do rights come from? They don't come from

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

government. Because you believe, don't you, that you have a right to something regardless of what your government says. Right now, the federal government is saying you don't have a right to an abortion, but you're saying you do. Where do you get that right from? Oh, you get it from God. Really? God wants you to kill your unborn child. Where are you getting that from?

As I mentioned earlier, look, our country was founded on theism. We believe in God given rights. And rights can only come from God. If they come from government, they're not rights, they're just preferences. And by the way, when people start claiming about, you know, that you're violating the separation of church and state and all this, we could go down a rabbit hole there and talk about how the separation of church and state is not in the Constitution. It's not. It was a letter that Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptists in 1803, and he was basically saying, we want to keep the state out of the church. Not we want to keep the church out of the state. It was a one way wall of separation. By the way, we unpack all this in the first book I wrote with Dr. Geiser called Legislating Morality. So, if you're really interested in this stuff, get the book Legislating Morality.

Anyway, this has nothing to do with the separation of church and state. We're not trying to establish a national church by saying you ought not murder your innocent children. That's not establishing a religion, it's establishing a morality it's legislating morality, and all laws legislate morality. Every law declares one behavior right and the opposite behavior wrong. A law that says that you have a right to an abortion is a law that is legislating a moral position that you have a moral right to kill your child. That's a moral position. And I think that no one has a right to a dead baby. You don't have a right to a dead baby. If the solution to your problem is a dead baby, you've got the wrong solution. So, all laws declare one behavior right and the opposite behavior wrong. You don't have a right to an abortion, regardless of what any religious document says, or any religious point of view with regards to what their religious point of view is. No one has a right to a dead baby. And you're not imposing a religion when you say that you don't have a right to a dead baby, you're legislating a moral position which does come from God.

But you don't have to be a Christian to know it. You don't have to be a Christian to advocate that people don't have a right to a dead baby. You just can't justify why murdering children is wrong unless God exists, just like you can't justify why you have a right to anything unless God

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

exists. Alveda King, who I think is the niece of Martin Luther King, labeled abortion a hate crime and she argued nothing has wreaked havoc on the black community and destroyed black lives more than the abortion industry. She said abortion is an injustice against the civil rights of the least among us. Abortion is systematic racism. A baby in the womb, no matter the skin color, is a child to be protected rather than a legal choice to be made. And why is she saying this? Well, while blacks make up 12% of the population, black babies are 38% of the abortions. Talk about systematic racism.

Now, the law - it really wasn't a law...we keep falling into that trap. But Roe v Wade, which made abortion legal, resulted in a racial outcome. It wasn't intended as a racist law, but it's led to a racist outcome whereby 38% of the abortions are black babies, despite being only 12% of the population. And notice when people are trying to make a case for abortion, what are they saying? They're saying things like, I have reproductive freedom, this is abortion care, I have abortion rights, it's reproductive justice, I'm pro-choice, it's my body my choice. What's in me is just the product of conception. Ladies and gentlemen, those are all just deceptive nice ways of saying, I have a right to a dead baby. You don't have a right to a dead baby. Why don't you just call it what it is? You're murdering an unborn child.

Instead of trying to dress it up with pleasant sounding terms like freedom, and justice, and choice, Satan comes as an angel of light, said the apostle Paul. He is always going to try and sell evil as good, and Isaiah said, Woe to those who call evil good and good evil. It is not good, quite obviously, to murder an innocent human being. And to try and make it sound good by putting nice sounding words on it doesn't change the fact that you're murdering an innocent human being.

Now, how do you make a case for this? We're going to have to have another show on this because I'm running out of time here. But let me just urge you to go to one website that will help you do this. I want you to go to CaseForLife.com. This is the website of my friend, Scott Klusendorf, who also teaches an online course for on abortion. I can't remember the exact name of the course, but it's a course that everyone needs to take now because it's making the pro-life case for this issue. And what Klusendorf shows in this one minute and seven second video that you will find on the homepage of CaseForLife.com is, he will show an abortion in all every trimester. You will see what an abortion looks like. And it's got warnings on this one

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

minute and seven second video, so be aware that when you look at it, you're going to see an abortion in the first, second, and third trimester. If you watch that video, and you still think abortion is a right, I question if you have a conscience at all, if your conscience hasn't been seared. And people are going to scream and wail and moan about seeing those images. But the reason they're going to do that is because they know those images communicate the truth. And that's what's important here. We need to communicate the truth.

I need to say one other thing. If you're hearing my voice right now and you've had an abortion, or you have encouraged an abortion - men - you need to put all that under the cross. It's all forgivable because of what Christ has done. What I'm here to say is, moving forward, don't encourage an abortion, don't have an abortion, make the case for life. Jesus has taken your punishment on himself, so accept the free gift that he provides. Do that, ladies and gentlemen, because that's the way forward. Repentance is always the way forward. Not doubling down and starting to cheer other people on who are having abortions, or saying you're going to aid and abet abortions, or saying you're going to do whatever you can to pay for abortions... No. Repent. Don't double down on your sin. We'll talk much more about this in a future podcast ladies and gentlemen. But no, murder is not healthcare, murder is murder. So, put that all under the cross.

By the way, if you want to learn more about issues like this, and other issues, including issues of philosophy, theology, and apologetics, in addition to taking courses at CrossExamined.org, you can get a degree if you go to Southern Evangelical seminary (SES). That's where I went. Their website is SES.edu. Wonderful courses. They have a wonderful program there. Check it out.

Alright, friends, I'll have a lot more next week. Happy Independence Day this week. Thank God for what he's done. Thank God for what you've done. Now, let's really get to work and make the case for life. I'm Frank Turek. See you next time. God bless.

CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG

