

The Top 10 Hasty Generalizations That Plague Our Society Today

(February 13, 2024)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, in this podcast, we are going to cover all of these 10 subjects: border security, racism, Christians and politics, same-sex marriage, transgenderism, Christian doubts, the age of the universe, election fraud, the effectiveness of the COVID vaccine, and Hamas and Israel. All of those 10 items, those 10 subjects we will cover here today. Now, obviously, you know we can't cover all of those topics here today, not in detail anyway. That would be impossible. Yet, I see many people on the right and on the left, making hasty generalizations. In other words, they come to a conclusion about these issues based on insufficient or biased evidence. In other words, there's a logical fallacy out there called hasty generalization.

That's when you come to a conclusion based on insufficient or biased evidence. You are rushing to a conclusion before you have all the relevant facts. And let me just show you that this happens on both sides of the political and theological aisle, that people tend to do this. They hear one comment from someone, and they immediately make a hasty generalization, and try and marginalize that person, or try and peg that person, or try and characterize that person on insufficient evidence. And we need to stop doing that. Let me give you several examples of this.

If you express concern over an open border, you're going to be called a racist, or you're going to be called un-Christian. Now, as I've mentioned before, many times on this program, everybody believes in borders. Do you have a lock on your door? Of course you do. You don't let anyone in your house. You have to vet people. Shouldn't we do that for the country? That's the question. And if you suggest that an open border is bad, however, you're going to be called a racist or un-Christian. That's a hasty generalization.

This is a complicated topic. And there may be different nuances to your position, when you say, hey, I don't want an open border. I want some border security. It doesn't mean you're a racist, doesn't mean you're un-Christian. It might be the most Christian thing you can do, as we'll explain later. Because if you don't have a secure border, people may be slave traded across the border. You're stopping slavery by having a secure border, sex slavery. We'll talk about it in a minute.

If you express any concern over say, racial disparities, some on the right are going to say you're woke. They're going to say, if you say, well, gee. You know, why do blacks test worse than whites and whites test worse than Asians? Why are there these different socio economic divisions between these three groups? Oh, you're woke if you start talking about that. No, no, no. I just wonder why that is. I'm not woke because I say there appear to be racial disparities, that people wind up in different places, it seems, based on their racial group. Why is that? Is it discrimination? Is it something else?



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

In fact, if you suggest that one of the reasons is family structure, like if you were to say that one of the reasons that the black community isn't doing as well as say, the white or Asian community is because there are fewer black fathers in the home, you're going to be called a racist. Well, maybe that's true, however. Maybe one of the major reasons for racial disparities is family structure. In fact, that's what the evidence shows. In fact, it was Thomas Sowell that pointed this out, that the biggest reason that people wind up in different places, is their family structure. It's not necessarily racism or some other ism. It's basically the fact that people aren't brought up in strong homes, they don't perform as well. They're not brought up with two-parent family, biological family. That's not racism. That's just what the evidence seems to show.

If you express any concern about politics and the future of your country, you're a Christian nationalist, which is supposed to be a slur. You know, there are people on the other side of the aisle, and they're expressing concern about the future of the country. Are we going to label them by some name that marginalizes them? We shouldn't. As I said before, and I said this on the podcast last week with Eric Metaxas, I think everybody ought to be involved in politics. If you want to be someone that's concerned about what happens to you and your neighbor, everybody should be engaged. But don't just tar people and try and discourage them from being involved by calling them a Christian nationalist, or some other pejorative term. But that's what people like to do.

If you express any concern about heresy in the church, you're divisive. You'll hear this. When in reality, if you read Romans 16, and many people sort of gloss over Romans 16 because we're going through the great book of Romans. When you get to Romans 16, Paul starts saying stuff like hey. Greet Rufus. And you're like, greet Rufus. What is that about? Say hi to so and so. And you're going, I don't need to read this. This is just personal stuff that he is putting in the text to the people he's writing the letter to, the people in Rome. But right in the middle of that section, he talks about how the divisive people are not the people calling out heresy, but the people teaching heresy. You might be in a church, and you think heresy is being taught and you call it out. People are going to say, stop being divisive. No, no, no. You're being divisive if you are teaching heresy.

Now, Natasha Crain has just released another article on this issue of the 'He Gets Us' campaign. And she mentioned this about a year ago, right after the Super Bowl. Because, as you saw the other night in the Super Bowl, there are a couple of 'He Gets Us' ads. And when you look at these ads, you realize, and Natasha Crain realizes as well. You can go to her website, NatashaCrain.com, to read her very insightful article. You realize that the people putting out these 'He Gets Us' campaigns are completely missing the point of Jesus. They want to say that Jesus is our example.

Ladies and gentlemen, please hear me loud and clear. Jesus is not our example unless He's first our Savior. If He's not our Savior, He's just another guy. He has to be our Savior to be our example. I mean, I agree. He's our example. But that's a result of the fact that He's our Savior, that He's God. And yet, these leftist ads which appear to be coming from the left, rather than the

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

biblical view, are trying to say, no, Jesus is just our example. Well, if He's not our Savior, if He's not God, why is He our example? Jesus did not come to make the world better. He came to make the world live, because our sin is now being taken care of by what He did on the cross. And then He's going to become our example, after we accept Him as our Savior.

And yet these ads, which may be all well-intended, are missing the point. They're missing the point completely. And when people say, oh, you're being divisive by calling this out, no, I'm not being divisive at all. I'm getting people back on, and Natasha Crain is trying to get people back on what the Gospel is all about. Just like Paul tried to get the Judaizers and the people in Galatia back on the true Gospel rather than the false gospel. If you look at the 'He Gets Us' campaign, what they're doing is, they're basically preaching a false gospel.

They're basically preaching that works is the way forward. And that's exactly what the Judaizers in Galatia were doing. They were trying to say you have to obey all these Old Testament rules and regulations in order to be a Christian. And Paul's saying, no, you don't rely on the law. You'll follow God's commands as a result of being saved. But actually obeying the commands doesn't get you saved. And yet, the 'He Gets Us' campaign seems to think that that's why Jesus came, to make us wash people's feet, to make us not hate.

Yeah, we hope that's the outcome. But that again, is the outcome. It's the result. It's not the cause. The cause is that Jesus is the Savior. He's the substitute. Then He becomes our example, but not before. Also, if you express any concern over radical Islam, you're Islamophobic, people will say. You know, even Richard Dawkins has realized this, the famous atheist. He says, Islamophobic. What is that? He said, Islam is not a race. It's an ideology. And he's right. You know, you have Muslims from every different ethnic group.

And if you look at the doctrines of radical Islam, you ought to be concerned about it. You ought to be concerned about jihad. You ought to be concerned about Sharia law. You ought to be concerned about the awful treatment of women. You ought to be concerned about these things. That's not phobic. That's just being concerned about the truth. And let me just ask you one question, ladies and gentlemen. For those of you that are talking about Islamophobic rather than Christianophobic, I just want you to think about this. Which countries are freer? Those that have a Muslim majority or a Christian majority? Think about it. Which countries that are run by the more radical Muslims, would you ever go to on vacation?

The only place you might go is Egypt because of its great history. But you're not going on vacation to Iran, to Iraq. You're not going to Sudan. You're not going to Libya. You're not probably going to Indonesia. You're not going to Saudi Arabia. But you will go to countries that have a Christian background. Why? Because they have freedom. That's why. Freedom to do good, not freedom necessarily to do evil. People always confuse freedom. Why don't you have the freedom to abort your child? Because that's a freedom to do evil we ought not have. We ought to have freedom of speech. We ought to have freedom of religion. We ought to have our

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly, and freedom of conscience. But we don't want to have freedoms to murder people.

So, don't let people. You know, when people call you a phobe, you ought to say, what do you mean by that? What do you mean by Islamophobe? What do you mean by transphobic? What do you mean by that? As we'll see here in a minute, it doesn't mean what you think it means. If you express any concern over the destruction of marriage, you're a homophobe. Again, if somebody calls you a homophobe, you ought to say, what do you mean by that? And how did you come to that conclusion?

In fact, one time that happened to me. I had just written the first edition of the book, 'Correct, Not Politically Correct.' The new edition is out. It just came out six or so months ago. 'Correct, Not Politically Correct: About Same-Sex Marriage and Transgenderism.' It was maybe about 2010, a couple of years after I wrote the first version of that, a same-sex marriage advocate called me a homophobe. I said, what do you mean by that? Oh, no, he didn't call me homophobic. He called me a bigot. That was it, a bigot. And I said, what do you mean by bigotry? He said fear and intolerance. I said, that's not the definition of bigotry.

The definition of bigotry is having a firm position on something without knowing the evidence, and not being open to being corrected by the evidence, kind of like making a hasty generalization. That's bigotry. And I said, sir, if there's anybody in this conversation who is a bigot, with all due respect, it's not me. It's you. Because I've written an entire book on this topic, which you haven't read, and yet you're calling me a bigot. You don't even know the reasons why I'm against same-sex marriage. And you might ask people when they say that you're a hater.

In fact, that's one of the other problems with the 'He Gets Us' campaign. Stop being a hater. What does that even mean? Because you know what is implied? If you disagree with somebody's moral position, you're a hater. I mean, when you support a particular moral or political position, does that mean you must hate people who disagree? If you're going to draw that conclusion, that sword cuts both ways, because everyone supporting say LGBTQ positions like same-sex marriage, must be considered haters as well because they disagree with Christians, Muslims, conservative Jews, and conservatives in general. Does that make them haters just because they disagree?

Now, maybe they are. But not necessarily so. And maybe there are people who are against same-sex marriage that do hate LGBTQ, people that identify that way. But that doesn't necessarily mean that's the case. If you disagree with somebody on a moral or political position, it doesn't necessarily mean hate. Now, some may call this bigotry. But bigotry is not mere disagreement. That's a misuse of the word bigotry. True bigotry is blindly holding to a conclusion without sufficient evidence and not being open to correction. That's a hasty generalization.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

A number of years ago, Dr. Michael Brown and I had a debate at Southern Evangelical Seminary, by the way, a great place to get an education in apologetics, philosophy, and theology. That's where I went, SES.edu. Go to SES.edu/Frank. You may get a scholarship if you go there. In any event, Dr. Brown and I were debating a couple of same-sex marriage advocates on the issue. I think the official title was, 'Does Love Require Affirmation?' In other words, in order to love somebody, do you have to agree with them? And at one point, of course, we were saying no, and the LGBTQ side was saying, yes.

And so, at one point in the debate, we turned to the other side, and we said, do you love us? And they said, yes. And then we asked, do you agree with our position? They said, no. I said, well, you just lost the debate then. Because that's our position, that you can love somebody and not agree with them. In fact, we all know this, that in order to love people, a lot of times you can't agree with them. Every parent knows this. Every parent knows that love does not mean approval. I mean, if you're a parent and you approve of everything your 13 year old wants to do, are you loving? No, you're unloving. You need to stand in the way of evil to love people.

You know, we've talked about this many times on this program. Love does not require approval. I'm actually going to be talking about this next week, up in Chilliwack (I think it is) in Canada, about an hour or so to the east of Vancouver. If you go to our website, CrossExamined.org, on the 24th and 25th. First of all, on the 24th, that's a Saturday. February 24, I'll be doing I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist all day with the church there. And then Sunday, we're going to be talking about 'Does Love Require Approval?' We'll be going into depth on this. It's at Main Street Church in Chilliwack, British Columbia.

And then before that, next Tuesday on the 20th, I'll be at a church in Fayetteville, Georgia. It's at Flat Creek Baptist Church, Flat Creek Trail Fayetteville, Georgia. We'll be talking about 'Correct, Not Politically Correct: About Transgenderism.' That is a Tuesday night event, February 20. And getting a little bit closer to home, this weekend, we're going to be along with Greg Koukl, Alisa Childers, and several others out near Dayton, Ohio at the Fearless Faith conference we're running. We're going to be talking about many of these cultural issues and how to have a Fearless Faith. Go to DaytonApologetics.com for more on that. That's DaytonApologetics.com for more on that.

Let me now go back to what we were talking about. Oh, yeah. If you express any concern over children being mutilated, or women losing to biological men in sports, or the government threatening to take children away from their parents like the Biden Administration has done, then somehow, you're transphobic. See, it's a hasty generalization. What does that even mean? Because I'm concerned about children, I'm concerned about women, and I'm concerned about parents, that somehow, I'm transphobic? That's just a way to characterize and marginalize somebody. It is not a serious way to have a conversation about the issues. And as I'm pointing out, both sides are doing this.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

In fact, here's a way a conservative might do this, a theological conservative. If you express any concern at all over, say, difficult Bible passages, you might be characterized as a doubter or a liberal. Well, that's just not fair. Look, on one hand, the Bible is a book that transcends time and culture. But on the other hand, you need to know something about the time and culture in which it was written, to see how it transcends time and culture. That raises questions which takes a lot of study to answer. And the only bad question is one not asked. The only bad doubt is one not expressed.

Because look, the Bible is a big, complicated book. It's written over 14 or 1500 years by 40 different authors, in several different countries, at different times and places. It takes some effort to know what the text really means. And when you just take it at face value, you might not understand what the text really means. It doesn't mean you're a doubter or liberal. It means you're asking good questions that have good answers if you look for them. So, ask the question. But conservatives, if someone has a doubt or question, don't say that you're a doubter, or you're a liberal, or don't ask questions like that. That's a sure way to drive someone away from the faith. Christianity is the most reasonable worldview. Show them that it is.

It's similar to this. If you express any concern at all about how a young earth interpretation of Genesis overlooks to whom the text was written, somehow, you're a compromiser. Now, you know who I'm talking about. I really like Ken Ham, but this is one of the things that I think is unnecessary in his rhetoric, calling people who don't hold to a firm young earth interpretation, a compromiser. Okay, that's not helpful. You ought to have a discussion of why you think the Bible teaches a young earth.

And you ought to look at the arguments for old earth and back and forth. But labeling people compromisers doesn't help. People have good reasons to believe that Genesis does not teach a young earth. We're not going to get into it right now. We don't have time. I told you, we're not going to be able to cover all these in depth. I'm just pointing out how people make hasty generalizations. And by the way, it's done on the other side, too. If you express any concern about an older Earth interpretation of Genesis, some will say you're a science denier. And that's not true. There are young earthers who try and give scientific reasons to believe the Earth is young. Now, you might not agree with those reasons, but they put them out there.

So, instead of characterizing people as compromisers, or science deniers, or whatever, stop engaging in this logical fallacy known as a hasty generalization, when you could at least just sit down and have a conversation about it. By the way, I mentioned several months ago, after I went to the University of Cincinnati, we went to the Ark Encounter. I met Ken and I was shown around the Ark Encounter. We had a whole program on it. That's a wonderful ministry of Answers in Genesis. I just don't think calling other Christians compromisers is helpful. I mean, I would never say to Ken Ham, you're a compromiser because you believe that the Earth goes around the sun.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Because, you know the Bible says that the sun rises and the sun sets. So, why don't you take that literally? Because you know the Bible is written in that case from an observational perspective, and you're using natural revelation to interpret what the Bible really means. It's making an observational point, not a scientific point. Yes, the sun rises and sun sets, observationally. But not literally.

And I'm not calling you a compromiser when you say that, for good reason. And by the way, we still do this today. Even in our scientific age, if you watch the news, the meteorologist on the news is going to say sunrise tomorrow at 6:42. He's not going to say, earth rotation will become apparent at 6:42. We don't say man, you're denying science there if you're saying sunrise and sunset. Why don't we do that when it comes to an interpretation of Genesis and the evidence we get from the natural world?

Also, if you express any concern at all about election fraud, suddenly you're an election denier. Now, the left always accuses the right of this. But that's all the left did for four years of the Trump presidency. What they did is they manufactured and pumped a bogus story out of the Hillary campaign about how the Russians help Trump steal the election. It was all proven false. And yet, they concocted this story and ran with it for several years, basically hamstringing Trump's first term. And instead of doing that, maybe we ought to present evidence and have a discussion on both sides. Both sides have claimed the election was stolen. Hillary claimed in 2016. Trump claimed it in 2020. Let's have a review of the evidence.

If you express any concern at all over the effectiveness, side effects, and profit motive of the COVID vaccine, you somehow are anti-science and don't love your neighbor, when the exact opposite may be true. You care so much about your neighbor, you don't want him to uncritically ignore the scientific data that shows these negative effects, and you don't want them to take something that's going to hurt him or her. And if you haven't noticed, the vaccine has several problems. Even the CDC admits that it does cause problems in some hearts of people, and they squelch that data. So, don't engage in a hasty generalization because somebody points out that the COVID vaccine has problems.

If you express any concern at all over the loss of religious freedom, you're a theocrat. Oh, really? A theocrat? We covered that in depth a couple of months ago when some scholar from the University of Pennsylvania tried to say that speaker Mike Johnson is a theocrat. She doesn't even know what the word means. I'm not going to go over that whole podcast again. You can go back and listen to it, a month or two ago.

If you express any concern at all about taking a stand before discovering facts, you don't care or are on the other side of the issue. I mean, are you ever pressured? You know, something just hits the news and in 10 minutes, if you don't have something on your Twitter feed that either supports or condemns it, there's something wrong with you. Well, hold on. I don't even have all the facts yet. I mean, you've heard people say silence is violence. In fact, Eric Metaxas said that on the last program. But Eric is saying it in the context of things that we know are evil. Some

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

people want you to call something evil when you don't even know if it is, when you don't have all the facts.

Silence is violence only when it's clear evil is being done, and you know it's being done. You know, I don't think we were created to know everything about everything in 10 minutes. And yet, that's what social media almost demands you know. As soon as something comes out, you've got to virtue signal. And if not, somehow, you're on the other side of the issue. That's a hasty generalization. It's a logical fallacy. Stop it.

If you express any concern at all, about the targeted rape and murder of civilians, including women and children by Hamas, a group dedicated in their charter to wipe out Jews, if you express any concern at all over that, somehow you don't think Palestinian civilians should ever be protected. Who said that? Somehow that means you agree with everything Israel does. No. But I am going to come out and say that Hamas is evil, and Hamas needs to be driven out of the land, just like the Amalekites were. Because with that charter, there's no negotiation. There's just, we're either going to kill you (that's what Hamas says), until you're all gone. Or we're just going to continue to conduct these attacks.

What's Israel supposed to do? What are they supposed to do? They're supposed to allow these people to continue to kill them? There's no self-defense here? But just because I say that, I don't want Palestinian civilians to be killed either. It's not the purpose of what Israel is trying to do at this point. They're not trying to kill Palestinian civilians. They're trying to free them from Hamas, and they're trying to protect themselves from Hamas. By the way, if you express any concern, here's a problem from the right. If you express any concern at all about something that the government in Israel is doing, somehow, you're antisemitic.

What? My friend, Charlie Kirk, mentioned something right after the event on October 7. You know, why wasn't Israel quicker to the draw on this? I mean, it took hours to get down from Jerusalem down to this area? Did they want this to happen? Did they allow it to happen? And suddenly, he's being called antisemitic. I know something about Charlie Kirk. He's not antisemitic. And yet, people will make a hasty generalization just because you point out a fact, or you point out an opinion that doesn't go completely in support of say, Israel or completely in support of any of these other issues we've been talking about. These are all hasty generalizations. They may or may not be true. But take more research and patience to discover whether or not they are true.

We don't respect one another, or have productive dialogue, when we make hasty generalizations about people and their positions. Now, don't make a hasty generalization about me or what I may believe about the issues I've mentioned here. Because each of these issues I just brought up could be the subject of several shows each. I mean, so far, I've just briefly talked about border security, racism, Christians and politics, same-sex, marriage, transgenderism, Christian doubts, the age of the universe, election fraud, the effectiveness of the COVID

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

vaccine, and Hamas and Israel. And I spent like a minute or two on each of them. And so, I can't cover them all in depth here. Don't make a hasty generalization about anything I've said.

In fact, that's one of the problems preachers have. I sympathize with preachers. They get 30-40 minutes on a particular section of Scripture or topic that they're covering, and they can't cover all the bases, pro and con, or whatever. They can't uncover everything about an issue. They may make a comment here or there. And they don't complete the circle on it. And people in the congregation go, what about that? And they make a hasty generalization. Don't do that. Give a little bit more grace. If you have a problem, you can talk to the pastor. But don't immediately assume that what he said leads to all these other conclusions that maybe he didn't even consider. Don't think that he believes what you think he believes, necessarily.

Now, it's interesting. I was going to do this show. I was planning to do this show last week for this midweek podcast. And I actually got an email from a skeptic who listens to the show. His name is Mike. Thanks, Mike, for listening. And I want to read some of what he said here, because I think he's actually providing an example of a hasty generalization. Mike wrote in and said this. He's a very intelligent guy. He's very thoughtful in what he says. But I can't read his whole email. It's a very long email, but I'll read a couple of sections of it and then I'll make a couple of comments.

Mike says, I listened to your show today with Eric Metaxas. It appears you're extremely concerned that we are heading in the direction of the 1930s to 40s Germany as a result of Christian leadership not speaking out more forcefully against our current social and cultural direction. Notice I didn't make a comparative reference to Hitler and Nazism.

Yes, thank you, Mike. Good insight, because as Eric said in the program, I'm not talking about when the death camps were going. He's saying our country in America is about where Germany was in 1933 or 1934. You go back and listen to the program to see what he meant by that. Anyway, Mike goes on. This overwhelming concern is apparently in spite of the fact that (and he gives three points here) Christian evangelism is one of the loudest and most influential voices in American politics in recent decades, at least since Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson took to the airwaves, and also to serious political involvement. The strength of this influence certainly explains Trump's march through Lafayette Square to hold up a Bible he's never read in front of a church that he's never attended in order to appeal to this influential community.

Number two, that our current speaker of the House has declared that his decisions will always be guided by his personal biblical worldview. And number three, and that a substantial majority of local, state, and federal politicians would likely claim an affiliation with some Christian religious denomination or another, unquote. Thank you, Mike. Good insights, but you're making my point for me. Christians are not making the impact congruent with their apparent numbers. If Christians are so outspoken and influential, then why are so many states making abortion legal up to the moment of birth? Why are they actually celebrating abortion?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You know, it used to be in the Clinton years, we needed abortion to be safe, legal and rare. What happened to that rhetoric? Now it's come to our state, says Gavin Newsom in California. We'll pay for you to come here. We'll pay for your abortion too. They're celebrating it. Andrew Cuomo, that was the governor. After they passed this law in New York about we're going to have abortion all the way up to the moment of birth, they lit up the Empire State Building in celebration. Why are you celebrating abortion if Christians are so outspoken and influential? And why are we mutilating children, many of whom have other mental health issues that goes beyond gender dysphoria?

And why are states like California paying people to come and do this if Christians are so outspoken and influential? It's interesting. Do you realize ladies and gentlemen, we mentioned this last podcast. There are more Christians in California, I believe, than any other state. There's 39 million people in California, despite Gavin Newsom's best efforts to thin out the population through abortion and driving people out of the high tax, high crime, psycho liberal state. It still has like 39 million people in it. So, you're going to have a lot of Christians. In fact, if all Christians voted biblically, California would be red. But they don't. It's interesting. About half of Christians don't even vote.

David Barton pointed this out. He said, do you realize that only 18% of the electorate actually elect the president of the United States. Why? Because about half of the people don't vote, and some don't even register. Anyway, he did all the math and he figured out that only about 18% of the people. So, about one in five actually elect the president of the United States because people just don't care. Most of them don't even get involved. Those that do, you only need about 18% to win, 18% of the voting population that is. I mean, if Christians were engaged, we wouldn't have this issue. And if Christians are so outspoken and influential, why does our country embrace same-sex marriage as if it's the same as natural marriage? It's not. And I have a whole book on this. I can't get into the details here.

I mean, if Christians are so outspoken and influential, why are their drag queen shows in kindergarten? And why are kids in public school learning more about sex and gender than how to read, write, and do arithmetic? Why are public schools teaching kids what to feel rather than how to think, if Christians are so influential? And why is our country \$32 trillion in debt if Christians are so influential? And if Christians are so influential, why were strip clubs, abortion clinics, and casinos open during the pandemic, but churches were closed? If Christians are so influential and have been over the years, why is there an open border so sexual slave traders, drug runners, and terrorists can enter our country while the people who are wanting to enter legally are still waiting in line?

You know, there's slavery going on right now, ladies and gentlemen. Yeah, there is. It's on the southern border. Young girls are being kidnapped into sexual slavery and they're being transported across the border by coyotes. Not the animal, you know what I'm talking about. That's going on. The most compassionate thing you could do would be to secure the border and make sure this stops. Also, it would be compassionate to stop the drug runners from coming in,

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

the drugs from coming in, terrorists from coming in. And if Christians were more engaged, we would have a secure border for the safety of everyone. And if Christians are so influential, why is the government and corporate America pushing the anti-Christian and pro-racism program called DEI, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (which doesn't really mean diversity, equity, and inclusion)?

Because if you have a diverse view, you're not going to be included. You're going to be excluded. You know my story. It's all in the book, 'Correct, Not Politically Correct', how I was fired from two Fortune 500 companies for writing a book against same-sex marriage in the name of inclusion, tolerance, and diversity. It's all in the book. I don't have time to tell you more about it now. And by the way, this DEI stuff is even happening in life and death professions such as the military, such as airlines, and medicine. I don't know if you saw Rob Schneider. Rob is a comedian. Years ago, he was on Saturday Night Live and an actor. I saw a little clip of him where he said, I just saw recently that United Airlines said that by such and such a date, they would ensure that 50% of their pilots were from minorities. And Rob said this. That's great news, because I'm sick and tired of these white pilots landing on time and safely.

Who cares what a person's color is? That's not the issue. The issue is, can you fly the plane safely? Who cares what the person's color is? The issue is, can you perform the surgery safely? Who cares what the person's ethnicity is? Can you lead men and women in the military? It has nothing to do with these inconsequential characteristics that have nothing to do with behavior. And yet, that's the nonsense that we're getting in our country, both from our government, and both from our corporations. In fact, it's even infiltrated churches now. So, if Christians are so influential, why is all this going on? In fact, let me ask you this.

If Christians are so influential in politics, why was Donald Trump the nominee in 2016 and now in 2024? You're saying, it's because of Christians! Wait a minute. Before you go there, there were other candidates who were far less obnoxious and had fewer personal integrity problems, people that claimed to be Christians, and yet they were not voted in, but Donald Trump was. Well, maybe it's because Christians haven't been involved enough politically for decades. They ceded not just the government, but also the cultural institutions that influence people politically, such as the media, law, and education. You know, when you take the godly influence out of something, it becomes godless.

That should be no surprise that those institutions, the government, media, law, and education have gone godless. So, in 2016, Christians were seeing. And it really started in 2015. That's when the primary started, or at least the campaigning started. Christians were seeing the culture and government becoming increasingly anti-Christian, ironically, because of their own neglect. And a plurality of them saw Trump as the one candidate who wasn't afraid to call many of these things out and would fight to correct them. So, once he got past the primary, what choice did Bible believers really have?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

Look, I didn't vote for Trump in the primaries. I wouldn't vote for him now in a primary. I'm just telling you. I think there are better candidates. But it looks like he's going to be the nominee again. You know, once he gets past the primary, because he actually did speak out on things that the other milk toast guys wouldn't speak out on. And those issues were at least largely caused by Christians being silenced, by Christians not being engaged enough. And he got to such a point, such a problem point, people said, we need somebody to take this on. And Trump was brave enough to do it.

So, once he's the nominee, Christians weren't going to support Hillary, who would support many of the immoral policies I mentioned here earlier in the podcast. They couldn't vote for that platform. So, Trump, arguably is the very result of Christians not being involved enough in politics, not being involved enough in the media, not being involved enough in law and education for decades. Yes, I'm sure there are people out there who are idolizing Trump. I'm sure there are people out there who are blind to his faults. I'm sure they're out there. But they're certainly not the majority. When people claim you're a Christian nationalist, that you're an idolatry, let me ask you a question ladies and gentlemen.

If the majority of Christians idolized politics, would we have the government and policies we have now? No, we wouldn't. All of the issues that I just went through, wouldn't be the case if Christians actually got involved and voted biblically. But we haven't. That's why there are Christians who are going to get behind anyone who's going to stand up and say enough of this. That's just where we are. I wish it were different, but it's not. They also know that in terms of policies, Trump's policies were good. It's because of Trump *Roe v. Wade* has been overturned, because he listened to the Federalist Society, who basically told him, here are the good judges. Trump didn't know who the judges were, but he took their advice.

Abortion never should have been in the courts. Abortion was never a constitutional issue. *Roe v. Wade* was decided wrongly, as even liberals will admit. It's not even in the Constitution. So, all the Dobbs Court did was put it back to the way it should have been, that it should be decided state by state, according to the Constitution. Now, morally, I think there should be a constitutional amendment that says life begins at conception. Why? Because it does. That's why. Now, if we can't get all the way there right now, fine. Let's incrementally save as many babies as we can.

And then Mike goes on to say this. I'm back to Mike's insightful letter to me, emailed to me. He goes, if the mission of Christian apologists like yourself is to convince skeptics to agree with your version of the truth, (my version of the truth, okay) I would suggest you do a disservice to that purpose by aligning with, directly supporting, or lending credence to things that have little or no basis in fact like a few of the topics referred with obvious support and agreement by you or Eric.

And a couple of things. I can't go through all this, but he mentioned election fraud. He mentioned the vaccine and trans kids being taken. I can't go through it all. But let me just say

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

one thing here about election fraud. There's fraud in every election, and there certainly were questionable activities in the 2020 election, from ballots being pulled out from under tables in Fulton County, Georgia. I saw it with my own eyes, friends. To election workers in Philadelphia blocking access to Republican observers. They're taping up cardboard on the windows and saying you can't look in here.

To entire nursing homes in Wisconsin voting 100% F=for Biden. And then you could also look at Dinesh D'Souza. We're probably going to have Dinesh on the program at some point here in the future. His documentary called '2000 Mules.' Now, whether or not any of that changed the outcome in 2020, I don't know. But I do know that mail-in ballots were identified by our own government back in the 2000s. There was a commission on this, and they said the worst way to conduct an election is with mail-in ballots. It's just fraught with fraud. Biden certainly got more ballots than Trump. But did he get more votes? When a Republican says no, he didn't get more votes, the Democrat says election denier.

But when Democrats deny Trump won in 2016, even as I mentioned, concocting this bogus story about Russian interference that hamstrung his administration, oh, that's just fine. There's no double standard here. Look, have a discussion about the data, pro and con, rather than making a hasty generalization. Now, obviously, we could spend podcast after podcast on election fraud. I don't even know if I'd ever get to the truth. But to say somebody is an election denier is a hasty generalization. They may have reasons they believe that the election was wrongly decided. The purpose of my podcast with Eric was not to talk about election fraud. He just mentioned it. We didn't even go into any detail.

And yet, Mike, I'm sorry. But you appear to be making a hasty generalization. There's a lot more to this. Maybe he's right. Maybe he believes it was really stolen. Maybe it was. Maybe it wasn't. But look at the data and make a decision based on all the data, not just the data you want to see. And both sides can take that advice. How about the vaccine? Mike was concerned about the vaccine, forced to get a jab. He says, yeah, Trump started it. Yeah, Trump did start it. Yeah, okay. Trump's wrong. But Trump didn't know. Trump's no epidemiologist. He didn't know Fauci was the Darth Vader of this whole thing. He had no idea. I mean, what would you do if you were president?

All these medical professionals saying, we've got to do this. We've got to do that. You don't know. And then, those same professionals are trying to squash dissent. They were actually censoring epidemiologists from Stanford University. They were contacting Twitter and big tech to try and squash all this stuff, YouTube censorship. Why? What are you trying to hide? Look, if you don't think there's problems with the vaccine, you haven't been paying attention. As I mentioned, even the CDC has admitted it. Even the CDC has squelched the known negative effects on the heart. And the voluntary reporting of side effects from the COVID vaccine dwarfs anything from any previous vaccine.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

There definitely are questions about this vaccine. I mean, how many boosters does Fauci have? "I had my fifth booster. I got COVID again. I don't know why." Come on. There's problems with it. Whether it's good or bad, I think the vaccine is bad. All the data I've seen, I think it's done more harm than good. Maybe I'm wrong about that. But if you have a different opinion, I'm not going to try and marginalize. I'm going to say, give me the data. You might be a science denier if you're ignoring the data, the negative side-effects of the vaccine. But I don't want to call you that. I want to have a discussion. Mike also mentioned something about trans kids, what Eric referred to about the kid being taken from his parents in Montana had some extenuating circumstances like the mom was in another country, and it was a Republican governor and all this.

I don't know the details of the case, but I do know that the Biden Administration on March 31, 2022, Mike, I can show you the links online to this. They basically said that they had the right to take your child from you if you didn't agree with gender-affirming care. Are Christians too involved in politics? If so, why is this happening? If your seven year old says that he's a girl, and if you don't agree, the government can come into your house and take that child from you? Christians are not very influential if this is actually what the administration has said.

Finally, I'll read Mike's second to last paragraph here. He says the notion that the U.S. was founded as a Judeo-Christian nation, in spite of the fact that there is no mention of Judeo, or Christian, or Jesus in our founding documents. Let me stop you right there, Mike. He is mentioned in there, the year of our Lord. But I agree with you. It's not in the essence of the document. Anyway, Mike goes on to say, they only mentioned creator and divine providence, and that under God was not added to the Pledge of Allegiance until the 1950's. Unalienable rights, and all men are created equal, and even the Golden Rule are not uniquely Christian. Let me stop right here.

That's why I said Mike, the Judeo-Christian ethic that is also called natural law, that our rights come from God. And the same God that gives us our rights is the same God that gives us natural law and the Bible. But you don't need the Bible to know that you have certain rights. However, if God doesn't exist, you don't have any rights. And our founding document, the Declaration of Independence, presupposes Judeo-Christian theism. Or if you want to be less overt, just natural law theism. It presupposes theism, in other words. All right? It's not deism. There's no divine providence, or a divine Day of Judgment, as the Declaration of Independence says in deism. It's theism.

So, you're not going to find these same rights under Islamic law. You're not going to find these same rights under the Hindu caste system. You're not going to find the same rights under an atheistic system like Mao, or like Stalin. You're only going to find these rights under people that have a Judeo-Christian background. Now, Europe has a Judeo-Christian background. We here in America are losing ours quickly. Even if you want to say it's just natural law, it's based on the Judeo-Christian God. Not a god that's quiet in a way and deistic, but a God that cares, a God

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

that will hold everybody in judgment at some point. There will be a divine Day of Judgment, as the Declaration of Independence says.

In fact, that's why the Declaration of Independence says that we appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world. Who's the Supreme Judge of the world? God. So, Mike continues. He says, and finally that your argument for Christian church is to stand up and fight for their principles was far more relevant back then when they went along and even supported slavery and more recently, in my own lifetime with Jim Crow. So much for a Judeo-Christian foundation. Exactly, Mike. Let me agree with you 1000%. Christians haven't been involved enough in politics. If they had from the beginning, slavery would have been stopped sooner, if never even adopted, and Jim Crow never would have existed. That's exactly my point.

So, let's not make hasty generalizations, friends. Let's have discussions, productive discussions. Stop calling people names. Stop characterizing people based on a tweet, or based on one post, or based on one comment. They may be wrong about what they're saying, but that doesn't mean they're wrong about everything. Give people enough grace to say, okay, maybe I don't agree with you on that. But maybe you're right on other things. Maybe we agree on other things. Stop with the hasty generalizations. That would be a way forward. That would be a way to have productive conversations.

And one of the ways you can have better productive conversations is to come to our Fearless Faith Conference. Go to DaytonApologetics.com. That's this coming weekend. Also, go down in early March to Sarasota, Florida. I'm going to be down there with a bunch of other folks like David Wood, Alisa Childers, Vocab Malone, John McCray. We're going to be at ApologeticCon, and I'm looking for the details on that. It's on our website right now. If you go to CrossExamined.org, click on Frank Turek events and Frank Turek Calendar. You'll see it. The great Chip Bennett is holding it. He's my friend who's the pastor of Grace Community Church in Sarasota. It's March 4-6.

And then if you also want to stop making hasty generalizations, you can join me, Natasha Crain, and Alisa Childers in the Unshaken conference on March 9 near Detroit, Michigan. All the details are on our website CrossExamined.org. You can also go to UnshakenConference.com for more on that. And we're looking in the next podcast or two, to have the great Jack Hibbs on the program for his brand-new book on the days of deception. You're not going to want to miss that. So, tune in for that in the coming week. And Lord willing, we will see you here then. God bless.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

