

Are Christian Politicians Trying to Set Up a Theocracy?

(November 10, 2023)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't know if you have noticed. But ever since the United States Congress got a new Speaker of the House by the name of Mike Johnson, many who are on the political left are absolutely apoplectic that he is an evangelical Christian. In fact, I came across an article, and there are many articles like this. I came across an article in The Guardian, which is a far left website/newspaper in the UK. And this is the headline, 'Mike Johnson, Theocrat: The House Speaker and a Plot Against America.' Now, despite the fact that this is a UK outlet, the author of this article is an attorney by the name of Marci A. Hamilton. She's a professor of practice and the Fox Family Pavilion, non-resident Senior Fellow in the program for research on religion at the University of Pennsylvania. So, she's an American.

Now, this article, threw one bomb after another bomb at speaker Johnson, and is also making these radical claims that the speaker is some kind of theocratic. And what I want to do is address these charges, because this has not only theological, but obviously political, moral, and even apologetic implications. So, the question is, are Christian politicians trying to set up a theocracy? Are they in some way violating the separation of church and state, whatever that means? Are they trying to impose just their values? And can you even do that? Can you even legislate morality? Now, many of you know that we've talked about some of these issues before. But I want to read a portion of this article to you and try and see how you might react to it. And then give my own comments on what she's saying here. Here's the way the article begins.

"The new House Speaker, Mike Johnson, knows how he will rule, according to his Bible. When asked on Fox News how he would make public policy, he replied, 'well go pick up a Bible off your shelf and read it. That's my worldview.' But it's taking time for the full significance of that statement to sink in. Johnson, is in fact, a believer in scriptural originalism, the view that the Bible is the truth and the sole legitimate source for public policy." And actually, what would he said, which is linked in this article. The complete quote from Mike Johnson is not in the article, but this is what he said completely.

He said, "This is not about the people themselves." He says, "I'm a Bible believing Christian. Someone asked me today in the media, they said, people are curious. What does Mike Johnson think about any issue under the sun? I said, well, go pick up a Bible off your shelf and read it. That's my worldview. That's what I believe. And so, I make no apologies for it." Then he added, "That's my personal worldview."

Then Ms. Marci said, he was most candid about this in 2016, when he declared, "You know we don't live in a democracy, but a biblical Republic." Actually, he didn't say, biblical Republic. What did he actually say? I'm going to play a clip for you of what he actually said. It's only about a minute long. Now, this goes back to 2016. This is when he was actually in the Louisiana House



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

of Representatives and had just decided to run for Congress. So, he got to the speakership of the United States Congress quite quickly. Anyway, here's what he said. Diego, play clip one.

MIKE:

So, we set up this system called a constitutional republic. You know, we don't live in a democracy, because a democracy is two wolves and a lamb deciding what's for dinner, okay? It's not just majority rule, it's a constitutional republic. And the founders set that up because they followed the biblical admonition on what a civil society is supposed to look like. And so, they set up this form of government. Our first president was George Washington. And he famously was leading his story public life. You know, he is our great general, our first president. We call him the father of our country. They wanted George Washington to be the king. But he denied that honor, because he said, no. We are doing a republic. This is something different. He moved out of office and the next person moved in, John Adams.

But he was giving his farewell address to all of his fellow countrymen, and it echoes down through the generations to you and me. This is his advice. And he says, listen. September 17, 1796, he gives a speech, and he says, of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are the indispensable supports. What he said was, the republic we built is not built on sand. It's built on two very firm foundations. They are religion and morality. If there ever comes a time in this country when those two pillars are taken away, the whole proverbial house is subject to fall.

FRANK:

So, that's the current Speaker of the House, although he said that in 2016. And he's essentially quoting George Washington, who said, that for this kind of government, a republic, which is not a direct democracy. You don't vote for everything. You vote for a representative who then votes for everything in Congress. You put that person in because we don't want mob rule. You need a more deliberate approach, and we don't have the time to follow all these issues in detail. We send people to Washington to do that for us. And so, they represent us. It's not a democracy. Anyway, he went on to say, after Washington, that if we can't bring morality, and religion, and the thoughts, or the ideas for morality and religion into the public square, then our country is going to be in big trouble. And he's absolutely right. And we're going to unpack why, here in this program.

This is not a violation of the Constitution. It's perfectly in sync with the Constitution. Anyway, let's summarize what he said to be fair, because she just cherry-picked a quote without giving the full context. She, meaning Ms. Hamilton, who wrote this article in The Guardian about Mike Johnson being a theocrat. In any event, he said, "So God created government to maintain order and the public peace." That's from Romans 13. Actually, it goes back all the way to Genesis 9. God created government and authority to prevent innocent people from being hurt because we're depraved. We're selfish. We need an authority to maintain order and protect innocent people from evil.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

This is why "Defund the Police" was the most idiotic political idea of the past several years. If you were to take away the police, essentially take away government, there would be anarchy. I mean, imagine if the police just said, hey, ladies and gentlemen, for the next 24 hours we're going to run an experiment. We're not going to enforce any laws. You can do whatever you want, and you'll never be prosecuted for it. How many murders would take place? How many rapes would take place? How many thefts would take place? Would the Best Buy survive? Would the Lexus dealership survive? No. None of these places would survive, because people would just go nuts because they didn't have an authority in place in order to ensure that law, and order, and justice were done.

Now, I'm not saying everyone would do this, but a lot of people would because we're depraved. And Washington's point, that speaker Johnson echoed back in 2016, is that if you can't bring these ideas from religion and morality into politics, then our country's not going to last. And as we're going to see, when we come back from the break, everybody's trying to impose a moral position. The only question is, what is your source for that moral position? Is it a source outside yourself or is it just you? If it's just you, well, why should we believe what you say is right? But if there is a moral source outside of ourselves that we are obligated to obey, then there's grounding for rights. Then there's grounding for right and wrong.

Otherwise, it's just one person's opinion against another. And all we're going to wind up doing is trying to impose through power on one another, our own personal preferences. So, we're going to talk about this. Are Christian politicians trying to set up a theocracy? What about the separation of church and state? Can you really legislate morality? We'll talk more about it right after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Back in just two minutes.

If you're low on the FM dial looking for National Public Radio, I can guarantee you you're not going to hear this on NPR. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist on the American Family Radio Network. Most of the radio stations, in fact, all of them are below 92 FM, about 180 stations across the country. This is also a podcast called I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. So, if you missed the program, you can actually listen to it wherever you get podcasts. And today, we're talking about this idea of a theocracy. An attorney who teaches at the University of Pennsylvania by the name of Marci A. Hamilton, has written a very caustic article about Mike Johnson, the new Speaker of the House. And she's claiming that Mike Johnson is some kind of theocrat, and he has a plot against America. And we're here trying to make some distinctions to point out that this is actually not true.

So, in the video clip I played you earlier, and there's a half hour program. We'll put it in the show notes. You can see Speaker Johnson in 2016, being interviewed on this. It's about 30 minutes. I'm just pulling a couple of clips out of it. And she actually referenced this particular interview. But unfortunately, she's cherry-picking quotes and she's not really giving the complete context of the quotes. As I mentioned before the break, what Johnson said was that we need a government to maintain order. Governments are created by God. And our government is a

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

government that was kind of unique in the history of the world. The founders knew that people were depraved, that they were bent toward evil. That's why they had a separation of powers. That's why they had a republic rather than a straight democracy. That's why they rejected the divine right of kings. That was rejected by the founders. They didn't want a king just mandating whatever the king thought was right, on the subjects under his jurisdiction. That's why they left England, because they realized King George was legislating immorally. King George was taking away their rights. That's why they said, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men were created and endowed by their government. No, it doesn't say that.

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. And the Declaration of Independence goes on to say, when a government doesn't secure those rights, like King George wasn't securing, then the people have a right to a new government. And if you read the Declaration of Independence, you will see all the ways in which King George was not legislating properly, was not protecting the rights of the colonists. So, the colonists, led by Thomas Jefferson and others, decided we need a new government.

And they set up a government, not based on a religious denomination, but based on a Judeo-Christian natural law government. This was unique in the history of the world. They didn't want the intolerance of having like one denomination you all had to be a part of. But they didn't want to have no God involved at all, because then they couldn't ground rights. So, they came up with the perfect third alternative, the natural law, the law that we sometimes now call international law. C.S. Lewis called it The Moral Law. Thomas Jefferson, in the Declaration of Independence, called it nature's law. It comes from God.

It's the same law that Paul says in Romans 2, the Gentiles who do not have the law, have the law written on their hearts. It comes from God; it comes from the same source as the Bible. But you don't need the Bible to know it. You don't need to be a Christian to have these rights. You don't have to require people who are citizens of the United States to be Christians. So, it's the perfect third alternative, the middle alternative, to having a completely sectarian religious government, or a completely atheistic, no way to ground rights government. And it seems like Ms. Hamilton doesn't recognize this when she writes.

Anyway. What Mike Johnson, the Speaker of the House went on to say if you watch the whole 30-minute interview, was that we can bring the ideas of religion or morality to help us make public policy. And he said, if you're saying we can't do that, you're crazy because Thomas Jefferson did that. George Washington did that. John Adams did that. Well, in the order of Washington, Adams, then Jefferson. In fact, Adams said, our government, our constitution is made only for a wholly religious and moral people. It is inadequate to govern any other. And as he also mentioned, Washington did, as I mentioned earlier, that religion and morality are indispensable supports. If you're saying that you can't use religion, or the natural law as a source for public policy, are you saying that we can only take ideas from atheists?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You know, we wouldn't have a country if all religious people were kept out of the process. Fifty-two out of the 55 Founding Fathers were all in some way, Bible believing Christians. They were part of different denominations, and many of them came from different states. And different states had different state churches. A lot of people don't realize this, but when the Constitution was ratified in 1787, or even the Bill of Rights in 1791, five out of the 13 colonies who had just become states, had their own state churches.

The federal government couldn't have a federal church, but the individual states could have churches. Massachusetts was the last one to get rid of their state church, and that was in 1833. It wasn't because they thought the Constitution prevented it. It's just they decided it wasn't a wise thing to have. And if you read the state constitutions, you will see that many of them require that you be a Protestant believer, or a Catholic believer, or some kind of Christian. Not in the federal government, but in the state governments.

And what Johnson also says, again, Mike Johnson, the new Speaker of the House in this interview, is he says, the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, which by the way, says nothing about the separation of church and state. What it says is Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Johnson went on to say that Jefferson talked about the First Amendment being a shield that prevents the government from telling the church what to do. This is where the whole separation of church and state language comes from. It's not actually in the document. It was quoted by Thomas Jefferson, and then quoted by a future Supreme Court case. I think it was *Turcaso v. Watkins* in 1947.

Jefferson was trying to tell the Danbury Baptists that he was not going to have the federal government interfere with their church. And so, he said there's a wall of separation between church and state. That was a one-way wall, preventing the government from telling the church what to do. He didn't mean the church couldn't tell the government or influence the government. Isn't it interesting that when we had the lockdowns, it was the government telling the church what to do. Exactly what Jefferson was against, and the founders were against. And by the way, Jefferson is not the one to really look to for the right interpretation of the First Amendment.

The person to look to is James Madison. He's the one that really authored the Bill of Rights. Thomas Jefferson in 1791, had nothing to do with the Constitution. Thomas Jefferson was the ambassador to France at the time. So, Jefferson has it right when he says it's a shield. But he's not the authority. It's Madison that is the authority, okay? And Madison, by the way, said one of the most pithy things ever when it came to government, and the fact that we needed some kind of government.

He said, if men were angels, no government would be necessary. I mean, imagine if we were angels, would we need anybody to govern us? Would we need anybody to protect us from evil of other angels? No. Angels aren't going to do evil. It's only human beings or demons that do evil, right? That's why we need a government. In fact, in the interview that Mike Johnson did, he

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

sounds like what you might sound like as a Christian, a believer who's interested in apologetics. He actually quoted 1 Peter 3:15, always be ready to give an answer for the hope that you have, but do this with gentleness and respect.

So, Marci Hamilton doesn't seem to have the proper historical view, nor the current view of what the First Amendment and the United States Constitution allows and doesn't allow, when it comes to using either moral or religious beliefs for public policy. In fact, here's what she says. I'm continuing reading her article. After she says that Johnson is in fact, a believer in scriptural originalism, the view that the Bible is the sole and legitimate source for public policy. She goes on to say, chalk up his elevation to the speakership as the greatest victory so far within Congress for the religious right, in its holy war to turn the US government into a theocracy.

All right, let me stop right here. This lady, by all accounts, is probably a nice woman. She's actually leading a group that is trying to protect children from sex-trafficking. I commend her on that. She's probably very smart. I don't want to anyway disparage her. But this is really just sloppy scholarship. Because she doesn't even define what a theocracy is. Let's just go to the Oxford Dictionary. This is what Oxford says about a theocracy.

It says a system of government in which priests rule in the name of God or a god. And it gives an example. The commonwealth of Israel from the time of Moses until the election of Saul as King, was a theocracy. Now, that's the proper definition of a theocracy. So, how does this represent Mike Johnson? Is he a priest? I mean, theocracies don't have people voting in representatives, or voting on laws. The laws of priests or imams, or religious texts, are merely put into place in a theocracy. That's not what we've had here in America, or what we have now. Mike Johnson is not a priest or an imam, nor can he just impose his own view. He has to get elected first. And then he has to persuade his fellow representatives, and the Senate, and the President to put any law in place.

Even if he wanted to impose, say, the Old Testament Law on the nation, he couldn't do it without the consent of the rest of Congress, or at least half of Congress. And so, to claim that Mike Johnson is trying to set up a theocracy, as we'll see here a little bit later, would be first of all impossible. Secondly, it would be unconstitutional. What she's confusing is the difference between religion and morality. And when we come back from the break, we're going to draw that distinction. We're also going to talk about the so-called separation of church and state a little bit more. Because she is completely confused.

Or if she's not confused, she's sort of not stating things she should state in order to create a bomb throwing piece to give the unsuspecting public the wrong impression about what appears to be, by all accounts, a nice, and honorable, and honest politician. All right, you're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio network. CrossExamined.org is our website. Back in two minutes.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Are Christian politicians like Speaker, Mike Johnson, trying to set up a theocracy? That's what many in the media have said. Marci A. Hamilton, writing at The Guardian seems to be saying that. Well, she is saying that in this article we're talking about. We'll put the article in the show notes by the way. So is Politico and many other people. But they're failing to make key distinctions. Ladies and gentlemen, no one's trying to set up a church. No one is trying to say that you have to be a member of a certain church and adhere to certain religious practices in order to be a citizen of the United States. That would be a clear violation of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. But we also have to make another distinction here. There is a difference between religion and morality.

Mike Johnson is not trying to legislate religion when he passes laws. He doesn't want to tell people where, when, how, or if to worship. That would be legislating religion. But he can't avoid telling people how to treat one another, and that's legislating morality. And that's what everyone's trying to do. All laws legislate morality. Marci Hamilton is trying to legislate morality. She thinks Roe v. Wade is a good thing. She thinks women have a moral right to choose to kill their babies. That's a moral position she wants to put into place.

She also thinks that same-sex marriage is a good thing, that a man, two men, or two women have the right to have the state recognize their relationship. And anybody who disagrees with them still has to recognize that relationship and actually use their artistic capabilities, and their free speech in order to support and advocate for those things. We'll unpack that further as we go here in our article. So, she's trying to impose a moral point of view as well. The only question is, whose morality should be imposed? And we can legislate morality without legislating religion.

Look, if Mike Johnson gets his political views from natural law or the Bible, which really is the same source, both the Bible and natural law. The source of the Bible and natural law is God, then he has to persuade others to go along. But my question is, from what source does Marci Hamilton or anyone else on the left, where did they get their political views that they want to impose on other people? I mean, question. Who is your source? Is it yourself, or an authority outside yourself? So, this is really a question about what sources can you cite when you put public policy into place? And if you're going to say that you can't impose any public policy that the Bible has, or that the Bible advocates for, wow. You're not going to be able to advocate for virtually anything. Because just about every one of our laws is in some way a derivative, good laws that is, is in some way a derivative of either the natural law or one of the 10 commandments.

You know, the Bible says thou shalt not murder. Can we legislate that? The Bible says thou shalt not steal. Can we legislate that? The Bible has laws against sexual assault and pedophilia. Is Marci Hamilton saying, well, that's not a good source. So, we can't have laws against sexual assault and pedophilia? The Bible says unequal weights and unequal measures are both alike, an abomination to the Lord. In other words, you ought not cheat people. The Bible also says you should do no injustice in court. In fact, she's an attorney. She goes to court to try and support children who've been abused, much to her credit.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Thank you, Marci. Well, the Bible is with you on that. The Bible says you shall do no injustice in court. You shall not be partial to the poor or defer to the great, but in righteousness, you shall judge your neighbor. The Bible also says we're all made in the image of God. And it says, as Paul says in Galatians 3, this is the solution to any problem we have with racism or partiality at all. He says, there's neither Jew nor Greek. There is neither slave nor free. There's neither male nor female, for you're all one in Christ Jesus. That's trading on the image of God, that we're all equal, in essence, under God. The Bible also says God loves the world and sent his Son to die for the world. And the very Savior that died for us says, love one another as I have loved you. So, you must love one another.

How did He love us? He sacrificed Himself for us. Now, love doesn't mean approval, and Ms. Hamilton might think it does. But if it does, then why doesn't she approve of our position? Because she probably thinks that in order to love us, she has to put forth policies that she thinks are right. So, love doesn't mean approval. Love means seeking what's best for the other person, and you need to have a standard by which to know what's best for another person. If that standard is just your personal opinion and it's not grounded in anything outside yourself, well why should I accept that? And why are you trying to impose that on me?

The Bible also says, love God and love your neighbor. And who is your neighbor? According to the Bible, even your enemy. A Samaritan in that context at Jesus' time, the Jews thought the Samaritans were their enemies. So, Jesus says, love your enemies. Do you think this is something we ought not do in public policy, Ms. Hamilton? James in the Bible says this, if you really keep the royal law found in Scripture, love your neighbor as yourself, you are doing right. But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as law breakers.

Ms. Hamilton, should we show favoritism? You probably don't think so. This is the cure to racism again. James also says this in James 1:27. Religion that God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this, to look after orphans and widows in their distress, and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world. Marci Hamilton is part of a group that seeks to protect children, at least that's what she says. That's what the Bible tells you to do.

So, if we can't use the Bible in public policy in any way, we couldn't have any laws that protect women, or protect widows, or protect orphans, or protect children. Proverbs 14:31 says, whoever oppresses the poor shows contempt for their maker. But whoever is kind to the needy honors God. Ms. Hamilton, should we help the poor and the needy through government policy? If you're saying we can't use the Bible as a source, I guess we can't do that. You're shooting yourself in the foot when you say Mike Johnson can't use the Bible as a source for public policy.

Now, most of these things I mentioned are moral principles that most people agree with. Ms. Hamilton probably agrees with these moral principles, at least many of them. She doesn't want to live in a world without these moral principles that are expressed in the Bible. Like the Bible, she's against murder, theft, sexual assault, and pedophilia. And she's for love, equality, and taking care of the poor, taking care of children.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

So, why is she against a man with a biblical worldview? I think we know why. Because she wants to choose what biblical laws she likes and disregard those she doesn't like, particularly with homosexuality and abortion. Now, let me say right up front, there is no current theocracy. Or let me put it another way. There are theocracies out there. Most of them are Muslim, okay? But the Bible does not want us to set up a theocracy. There's a new covenant. There was only one theocracy in the Bible. It was ancient Israel.

Even the Oxford Dictionary got this right. It went from Moses to just prior to Saul. And it wasn't a very strong theocracy, because during Judges, they didn't have a king, and everyone did what was right in their own eyes. It was pretty much for a very short period of time, from Moses to maybe early on into Joshua, they had somewhat of a theocracy. After that, there hasn't been a theocracy that the Bible has approved of since. In fact, Psalm 147:20 says He's only given His laws to Israel.

And a theocracy is a nation. Christianity is not a nation. But that doesn't mean we can't use biblical principles, particularly the universal moral laws that are consistent with what is said in the Old Testament and consistent with what it said in the New Testament. Not all the theocratic laws, but the universal laws like thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not murder. Thou shalt not steal. You ought to honor your mother and father. You should not bear false witness. You should not rape. You should not have sex with children, these kinds of things. We can take those universal laws and put them into policy. And our country, thankfully, has many of those laws in place.

In fact, if you read Leviticus 18, our country is going to agree with virtually every law in there except one or two, homosexuality now and something about not having sex during a woman's menstrual period. Other than that, we still agree with just about every one of those laws, like 17 out of the 19 laws in Leviticus 18. Ms. Hamilton, if you're going to say that a politician can't use the Bible as a source for public policy, you're going to gut most of our criminal laws. But you just don't like what the Bible says about thou shalt not murder when it comes to children. You don't like what the Bible says about marriage, and about how sex should be just between a man and a woman inside of marriage.

I'm continually reading her article here. She says, "Since his fellow Republicans made them their leader, numerous articles have reported Johnson's religiously motivated far-right views on abortion, and same-sex marriage, and LGBTQ+ rights." Well, thank you for not overstating the case or sensationalizing it with far-right. But that barely scratches the surface. She says, "Johnson was a senior lawyer for the extremist Alliance Defending Fund."

All right, first of all, you don't even have the name of the organization right. The name used to be Alliance Defense Fund, not defending fun. And then you say later, Alliance Defending Freedom. You got that right. That's what they're called right now, a great organization. They're not far-right. They're an organization defending religious freedom in the public square for Christians and even non-Christians. And anyway, she goes on to say that "Johnson was an attorney there from 2002 to 2010." And then she goes on to say that "this is the organization

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

responsible for orchestrating these legal arguments to obtain a ruling from the Supreme Court permitting a wedding website designer to refuse to do business with gay couples." You got that wrong too Ms. Hamilton. I'm sorry. Yes, they were involved. But they didn't refuse to do business with them. The person you're talking about agreed to serve gay couples in many capacities.

What she refused to do was be forced to use her creative abilities to promote a behavior that violated her conscience and religious beliefs. And in your heart, you know, she has the right not to be forced by anybody to advocate for a behavior that she doesn't agree with. I mean, Ms. Hamilton, let me ask you this. Should a gay T-shirt maker be forced to make T-shirts that say God is against same-sex behavior? Or should they be forced to make T-shirts for that notoriously bad church called the Westboro Baptist Church where they had all sorts of slurs on their T-shirts? No. No person should be forced to make those messages, whether they're Christian or not. Anyway, we're going to cover more right after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Back in two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're talking about the intersection of the Bible, natural law, and religious beliefs on politics today. And I wrote an entire book on this with Dr. Norman Geisler, way back 26 years ago, called 'Legislating Morality.' Is it wise? Is it legal? Is it possible? That book is still out there. And I always try and write evergreen books. What do I mean by evergreen? I don't want to write books that are too current events related because, you know, they go out of print quite quickly. And I'd rather write about principles rather than, you know, just something specific, an issue that might go away in a year or two.

And so, 'Legislating Morality' is still an evergreen book. It's talking about how all laws legislate morality. It's making some of the distinction we've been making on this program here, that we can legislate morality without legislating religion. We can inform our public policy by a religious writing or a natural law moral code. And if we can't, by the way, we could have virtually no laws against evil. We can do that without any violation of any United States Constitution or any amendment because all laws legislate morality. So, if you want to go further, get the book 'Legislating Morality.'

If you want a more recent treatment of a topic, not as in-depth, but it treats same-sex marriage and transgenderism, get the newly updated book that I just updated a few months ago called, 'Correct, Not Politically Correct: About Same-Sex Marriage and Transgenderism.' Both of those books, by the way, 'Legislating Morality' and 'Correct, Not Politically Correct,' are not quoting Bible verses. These books are making the natural law case that morality is legislated, and that you can legislate morality from natural law, or even from the Bible, and not be in violation of the Constitution. So, check those out.

But in any event, we're reading an article that an attorney from the University of Pennsylvania, her name is Marci Hamilton, wrote for The Guardian. The title of it is 'Mike Johnson (He's the

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

new Speaker of the House) Theocrat: The House Speaker and a Plot against America.' I've only gotten through about a third of the article so far, maybe not even that far. There's a lot here. We're not going to get through it all. And maybe we'll do a midweek podcast to continue. Anyway, she goes on to say that the ADF also played a significant role in annulling Roe v. Wade. Well, they just argued one of the cases that went to the Supreme Court, and that overturned Roe v. Wade. And it should have been overturned, as we've talked about on this program before, as even liberals will admit. Roe v. Wade was a made up law that had nothing to do with the Constitution. There's nothing in the Constitution about abortion. There never was.

So, if you want to have a law against abortion, you've got to convince (or a law saying that everyone has a right to an abortion), you have to either amend the Constitution or send it back to the States. And that's exactly what has been done. Now, by the way, no extra charge for this. You could see that Ohio just voted to have abortion all the way to birth. And the reason for that is because the left lied about what the amendment really was about and obfuscated what was really supposed to be done with this. But let me also say this. If we're going to make strides in this, and maybe we'll do a podcast on this again. I'm just going to throw this out there. I can't unpack it completely.

But if we're going to make strides in the pro-life arena and save at least some babies, we've got to go for saving some babies rather than trying to completely ban abortion. Now, morally, I think abortion ought to be banned. But politically, if you can't save all babies, is it better to save some? And I think it is. So, don't go for a complete ban. You know, just like Governor DeSantis did down in Florida. He has a six-week band. Other states have a 12-week ban. If you can't ban it completely because you haven't educated the citizens enough, then you've got some work to do. You've got to work incrementally to get there.

In any event, let me go back to Marci Hamilton's column. She says the ADF has always been opposed to privacy rights, abortion, and birth control. Now Roe is gone. The group is laying the groundwork to end protection for birth control. Now, this is just a flat out lie, ladies and gentlemen. I'm sorry. That's what it is. ADF is a group of attorneys. They are not legislators or a political group. They are not against birth control. They may represent clients who may have a religious objection to being forced to support abortion as birth control, but they are not lobbying legislators to outlaw birth control. This is also a lie of the pro-abortion groups, like the folks in Ohio.

They try and scare people to say that a vote to restrict abortion is a vote to outlaw the pill or contraceptions. No, it's not. It might be to outlaw the abortion pill (because that is abortion), but not preventing pregnancy. Anyway, she goes on to say this. Those who thought Roe would never be overruled should understand that the reasoning that Dobbs v. Jackson (that's the case that overturned Roe) is not tailored to abortion. Dobbs was explicitly written to be the legal fortress from which the right will launch their attacks against other fundamental rights their extremist Christian beliefs reject. Now, by the way, ladies and gentlemen, again, all this

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

emotional language here, extremist. Ms. Hamilton, many of the precepts in the Bible that I read earlier, you probably agree with. Are they extremist? I mean, really. Please.

I'll tell you what extremist is, to say that you can take a fully full-term baby, drill a hole in the back of her neck, and suck her brains out. That's extremist and that's what you're for. If you're not for that, please email me, hello@crossexamined.org. I'm happy to have you on this program to discuss this. Anyway, Ms. Hamilton goes on to say, "They are passionate about rolling back the right to contraception research." That's not the case. "The right to same-sex marriage and the right to sexual privacy between consenting adults." None of those are true. Well, obviously, they don't think same-sex marriage was properly decided. That's true. But I might ask Ms. Hamilton, why is same-sex marriage right? Where do rights come from?

In order to have any rights at all, you must steal a moral standard from God. But you're claiming that God shouldn't be a part of politics. You can't have it both ways. If you want to have a justification for rights, you have to ground them in God. Otherwise, you don't have rights. You have preferences. If you can't justify your view by appealing to an objective morality given by God, all you can resort to is power. And that's exactly what you seem to be resorting to. You want to shut other people up. You want cancel culture. You want to cheat to win. I don't know if Ms. Hamilton wants to cheat to win, but many on the left, they'll cheat to win.

And by the way, there's probably some on the right that want to do that as well. Look, if you don't have principle, you can only govern by power. And when you can't argue the truth about these things, you tend to merely try and shut other people up. Now again, we unpack all this. If you want to see the natural law case for why same-sex marriage and transgenderism doesn't work, get 'Correct, Not Politically Correct.'

Man, I got so much more here. She then goes on to say, "Johnson's inerrant biblical truth leads him to reject science. Johnson was a young earth creationist, holding that a literal reading of Genesis means that the earth is only a few thousand years old and humans walked along dinosaurs. He has been the attorney for, and a partner in the Kentucky Creation Museum and Ark amusement park, which present these beliefs as scientific fact. A familiar sleight of hand where the end, garnering more believers justifies the means, lying about science. For them, the ends always justify the means. That's why they don't even blink when non-believers suffer for their dogma."

Alright, I was just at The Ark Encounter. In fact, I met with Ken Ham this week. And I think the Ark Encounter is great. All right? I don't agree with Ken Ham on necessarily young earth, as you know. I think the evidence is better that it's old. But I'm not going to divide with him as a believer. And I think what he did in the Ark Encounter is quite impressive, actually. And by the way, what she's saying here, that Johnson was an attorney for them, that case had nothing to do with the age of the Earth. In fact, I was talking to the gentleman that showed me around. And I'm going to have him on the program here soon, about the Ark Encounter. I was talking to him about that case, and it had nothing to do with the age of the Earth.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

It had to do with the fact that the state of Kentucky was discriminating in its tax policies against The Ark Encounter because it was a religious group. And that was illegitimate. That's why the Alliance Defending Freedom won the case. You can't discriminate against people because of their religion. That's a violation of the First Amendment. And Ms. Hamilton, you ought to know that. You're a First Amendment attorney, apparently. It had nothing to do with the age of the earth. And by the way, science doesn't say anything, scientists do. You may disagree with the arguments that a group of scientists make about the origin question. But Ken Ham's group does try and make scientific arguments about how old the universe is, but that's not the same as denying science.

Ironically, the folks who are denying empirical science, science that we can see right in front of our eyes. Look, the age of the universe is a forensic question. It's trying to get an historical point. And you don't have all the evidence necessarily in front of you. You can't go back in history and see everything. You can see some of it, but not all of it. But in empirical science, you can see what's staring right in the face, the fact that there are only two genders, and the fact that an unborn child in the womb is a human being.

And yet, Marci Hamilton is for transgenderism and she's for abortion. So, who's denying science here? It's her. It's not necessarily young earth creationists, although you may disagree with their conclusions. They're trying to put forth scientific arguments. You, Ms. Hamilton, are ignoring what's right in front of you for your ideology. Now, I'm going to have to pick this up in the midweek podcast because there's so much more. I even have another clip from Mike Johnson pointing out that what Marci Hamilton in this article is saying is wrong.

So yes, you can use the Bible as a source without setting up a theocracy, without violating any part of the Constitution. Everybody's trying to impose a moral point of view. Ms. Hamilton is, so is the left. The only question is, what's the right moral point of view? And we'll talk more about that in the next podcast. Tune in on Tuesday. If you're listening on the American Family Radio Network, you're going to have to go to the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast to hear it. See you there.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**

