

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

## Is Donald Trump Helping or Hurting the Pro-Life Movement? | with Scott Klusendorf

(April 12, 2024)

### **FRANK:**

Ladies and gentlemen, there's been some explosive comments made by former president Trump, now officially, I suppose, the republican candidate for president later this year. There are comments about abortion, and you probably only heard little snippets of it. It's about a four minute clip. Let's listen to the entire clip. And then I have a guest on who will react and respond to what the former president said. Here we go.

### **DONALD:**

Under my leadership, the Republican Party will always support the creation of strong, thriving, and healthy American families. We want to make it easier for mothers and families to have babies, not harder. That includes supporting the availability of fertility treatments like IVF in every state in America. Like the overwhelming majority of Americans, including the vast majority of Republicans, conservatives, Christians, and pro-life Americans, I strongly support the availability of IVF for couples who are trying to have a precious baby. What could be more beautiful or better than that?

Today, I'm pleased that the Alabama legislature has acted very quickly and passed legislation that preserves the availability of IVF in Alabama. They really did a great and fast job. The Republican Party should always be on the side of the miracle of life and the side of mothers, father, their beautiful babies, and that's what we are. IVF is an important part of that. And our great Republican Party will always be with you in your quest for the ultimate joy in life.

Many people have asked me what my position is on abortion and abortion rights, especially since I was proudly the person responsible for the ending of something that all legal scholars, both sides, wanted and in fact, demanded be ended. Roe v. Wade. They wanted it ended. It must be remembered that the Democrats are the radical ones on this position, because they support abortion up to and even beyond the 9th month. The concept of having an abortion in the later months and even execution after birth, and that's exactly what it is.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

The baby is born, the baby is executed after birth, is unacceptable, and almost everyone agrees with that. My view is now that we have abortion where everybody wanted it, from a legal standpoint, the states will determine by vote or legislation, or perhaps both. And whatever they decide must be the law of the land, in this case, the law of the state. Many states will be different. Many will have a different number of weeks, or some will have more conservative than others, and that's what they will be.

At the end of the day, this is all about the will of the people. You must follow your heart, or in many cases, your religion or your faith. Do what's right for your family and do what's right for yourself. Do what's right for your children. Do what's right for our country and vote. So important to vote. At the end of the day, it's all about will of the people. That's where we are right now, and that's what we want, the will of the people. I want to thank the six justices, Chief Justice John Roberts, Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, Brett Kavanaugh, Amy Coney Barrett, and Neil Gorsuch. Incredible people for having the courage to allow this long term, hard fought battle to finally end.

This 50 year battle over Roe v. Wade took it out of the federal hands and brought it into the hearts, minds, and vote of the people in each state. It was really something. Now it's up to the states to do the right thing. Like Ronald Reagan, I am strongly in favor of exceptions for rape, incest, and life of the mother. You must follow your heart of this issue. But remember, you must also win elections to restore our culture and, in fact, to save our country, which is currently and very sadly, a nation in decline.

Our nation needs help. It needs unity. It needs us all to work closely together. Democrat, republican, liberal, conservative, everyone. We have to work together. We have to bring our nation back from the brink. And that's where it is. It's at the brink. And we will. We will do it. I promise you, we will do it. Always go by your heart. But we must win. We have to win. We are a failing nation, but we can be a failing nation no longer. We will make our nation great. We will make our nation greater than ever before. Thank you very much.

**FRANK:**

A lot was said in those four minutes, ladies and gentlemen, a lot to respond to. We're going to get to all of it during this broadcast. And to help me do that, the author of 'The Case for Life,'

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Scott Klusendorf, is with me. Scott is also the instructor in our online course called 'How to Convince People to Be Pro-life.' Scott, what's your overall reaction to what the former president just said?

**SCOTT:**

More bad than good. Here's the good part. He's right that having children is a blessing. He's right that it's a gift for couples that want to have kids. But it's not an absolute right to have a child, especially if you're affirming a technology that potentially destroys a lot of embryos in the process. IVF is not a neutral technology. A lot of embryos are created and then discarded. Some are selectively reduced, meaning they're implanted.

And then if they turn out to have any kind of genetic disorder, they're weeded out, or if there's multiple pregnancies that result, they reduce the number of embryos by effectively doing an abortion. So, these are things that we need to be careful about. And the president putting his stamp on IVF as a so-called right that the Republicans will always support is problematic. And here's the key thing, Frank.

I think there's a real difference between saying it's good that Roe v. Wade got overturned because it was bad law, had bad legal precedent behind it, and then saying that the ultimate good is for the states to decide. The ultimate good is not for the states to decide. What if a state decides that spousal abuse is okay? Does that mean we should respect the will of the people and there should be no federal law against that?

**FRANK:**

Yeah. Or slavery. We've had that in the past.

**SCOTT:**

Or slavery. Yeah. The federal government's job is to protect natural rights. And the pro-life argument is that the unborn have a natural right to life. That's a right, Frank, that is pre political. It is not generated by the state or by the federal government. The federal government's job is to recognize that right and protect it. And one of the dangers of Dobbs, because the court did not rule on the status of the unborn. It left that question open for people, as Trump said, to "follow their hearts."

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

But, Frank, I think we both know following your heart is one of the worst pieces of advice you could give somebody, because biblically, we understand the heart is desperately wicked. It's not good. We're not by nature good people. So, we don't want to follow our heart. We want to follow objective moral truths, including the truth that says each and every human being has intrinsic value because it bears the image of its maker.

**FRANK:**

By the way, we just released a new animated video about following your heart, and it's called 'Guard Your Heart.' So, go to our YouTube channel that came out on Easter Sunday. And that's just one of many reasons why you can't follow your heart without moral restraint. One is, is that your heart is deceitful and wicked and it wants what it wants.

**SCOTT:**

Yep.

**FRANK:**

We're going to unpack more of this a little bit later, Scott. But I do want to get to the political calculation that Trump had here. Why is he trying to have it both ways, it seems?

**SCOTT:**

Well, here's the reality. And pro-lifers aren't going to like me for saying this, but I'm going to say it anyway. The culture is not with us, Frank, on this issue. A lot of pro-life conservatives think there's a sleeping giant out there. There's this massive people that if we could just convince them to get more politically engaged, we could win the debates over abortion, over same-sex marriage, over transgenderism.

There is no sleeping giant out there. And if there is one, it's not on our side. It's on the other side. We have a worldview challenge in front of us. The culture does not believe the unborn are members of the human family. And that's the crux of the abortion debate. The debate is not about choice. It's not about privacy. It's not about trusting women. It's none of that. We're having a national debate over who counts as one of us, and most people think the unborn don't count.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

Well, we're going to see that they do count because we're going to have a lot more time with Scott Klusendorf, author of 'The Case for Life.' It's a brand-new edition, by the way. Everything you ever wanted to know about the issue you can probably find in that brand-new version. So, check it out. We're back in just two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

If you're low on the FM dial looking for National Public Radio, go no further. We're actually going to tell you the truth here. That's our intent, anyway. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio network, website [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). We're talking to my friend Scott Klusendorf, the author of 'The Case for Life,' brand-new edition of the book, by the way. And the reason we're talking to Scott today is because over the past week or so, there's been a lot of talk about abortion and the right to life, and there's an Arizona law. We'll get into all that.

And Scott is an expert on these issues. So, we wanted to get his perspective. Scott let's go back to what we were talking about just before the break, and that is, you were saying you don't think there's a sleeping giant of pro-lifers out there that are going to wake up and suddenly say, yes. We need to restrict abortion more. However, about half of Christians out there do not vote.

**SCOTT:**

That's true.

**FRANK:**

If we could get them to vote more, it might help. In fact, David Barton has pointed out that about 18% of the electorate puts the president in office because so many people don't vote. And then you just have to win a plurality to win the presidency. So, your votes do matter. We don't want to discourage anybody from voting and getting more people to vote.

But, Scott, in terms of the life issue and particularly the abortion issue, it appears to me that Trump, on one hand, is trying to appeal partially to the pro-life base, but he's also trying to run a little bit of middle ground here to try and ensure that the people who might not be very pro-life will still vote for him. What's your reaction to that?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**SCOTT:**

Well, I think that's exactly what he's doing, and I get it. Look, if you look at what's happened since the Dobbs decision, pro-life has lost every time it's been put to the vote of the people. So, you're looking at red states like Ohio, Kentucky, Kansas, Montana, where votes were put forward. Frank, it's so bad that in Montana, we couldn't even get voters in a red state to vote to protect children who survive abortion procedures. That's pretty bad.

And the reason why is the public is buying the misinformation campaign from the other side that says that if we have laws that protect unborn humans, women who have miscarriages will be prosecuted for murder. You won't be able to get lifesaving ectopic pregnancy surgeries if you need it. And women are going to die because of these new laws. Well, the public is buying it. And if you couple that with their basic worldview assumptions that say truth is what we want it to be, in other words, follow your heart, as the former president said, well, what he's doing is tapping right into where a lot of Americans are.

They want to follow their heart. They want themselves to be the final arbiter of what's right and what's wrong. And Trump knows that. So, he puts a special focus on following your heart, which is disastrous. A lot of slave owners in the antebellum south followed their hearts. That didn't make it right.

**FRANK:**

That's absolutely correct. Now, let's suppose, Scott, that you're the benevolent dictator that has to convince the American public that an unborn child is a human being deserving of rights. How do you convince them of that?

**SCOTT:**

If I were a politician, Frank, or if I were counseling a politician who is pro-life, here's what I would tell them to say. You need a seven second soundbite that will make the cut for the evening news. And here it is. I am pro-life because it's wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings. Stop right there. Say no more. Just repeat that over and over again.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now, there's two reasons why I say that. Number one, it puts the focus where it belongs, the moral question of what is the unborn? And it makes the status of the unborn the issue, which it should be. But secondly, it keeps politicians from tripping up over all these what about issues. Because immediately the press will say to them, well, what about the ten year old that's pregnant from rape? Are you going to force her to carry a baby to term?

What about, you know, the woman who just doesn't want to be pregnant right now because of her career? And then politicians, because they're not trained apologists, end up tripping up and their soundbite doesn't make the news. All that makes the news is the part they flubbed up. So, I think less is more if you're a politician. Simply state, I oppose abortion because it's wrong to intentionally kill an innocent human being. Bingo. You're done.

**FRANK:**

You would answer if the reporter came back and said, well, what about rape or what about incest? You would say the same thing.

**SCOTT:**

As I said a moment ago Miss Reporterette, I oppose abortion because it's wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings. If you would like to read up more on the issue, I invite you to take a look at my website. And on that website, I would have some very carefully crafted statements that make it clear that the moral issue of abortion does not turn on how one is conceived. I would make it very clear that we have options for women that are facing life threatening situations like ectopic pregnancy. I would make it very clear that no woman is going to jail in any state because she has a miscarriage. Those are misinformation and lies.

**FRANK:**

You know, you've said this before, Scott. I think it's a great insight that abortion is not difficult intellectually. It's difficult emotionally. Unpack that for us.

**SCOTT:**

Well, abortion morally is not complex. Psychologically it is. And here's what we mean. If you hear about a 14 year old girl who's pregnant, her parents are going to kick her out of the house. Her boyfriend has dumped her. She's going to lose the chance to go to school and get an

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

education. She's going to lose career opportunities for the next 18 years because she's raising a kid. All of us naturally feel sympathy for her, but it doesn't follow that because we feel sympathy for her, there's no morally right thing to do.

And whether abortion is right or wrong, Frank, comes down to one fundamental issue. What is the unborn? If the unborn are not human, Frank, I have no opposition to abortion at all. Have as many as you want. But if the unborn are human, then the arguments we use to justify killing them need to be just as compelling as those we would bring to the table for killing two year olds or five year olds. So, the real issue here is not psychological hardship. It's not economic well-being. It's the question, what is the unborn? That's the simple moral truth in front of us.

**FRANK:**

Now, in Scott's book, ladies and gentlemen, 'The Case for Life,' he goes through so many different arguments against the pro-abortion position, and he gives you a robust defense of why an unborn child is a human being. But Scott, I've never seen anything more powerful than the 1 minute video you have on [caseforlife.com](http://caseforlife.com). I think if people see that 1 minute video and they still think that abortion is a right, I'm not sure their conscience is functioning properly. Now, the problem is that video is too true. In other words, it just cuts through all the rhetoric, and it gets right to the point. What is on that? What is on that video?

**SCOTT:**

Well, you see three sequences. You see the conclusion of a first trimester sequence where you see severed hands and severed fingers. You then see the conclusion of a second trimester procedure where you see dismembered arms and legs. Then you see a third trimester sequence where you see a child delivered that has been killed and the child is there. I mean, it's unmistakable.

But hey, listen, in states right now, like Ohio, Michigan, Colorado, California, most of your blue states right now are enshrining abortion up through the 9th month. And so, these abortions are happening. They are real. And here's one of the big problems, Frank. It's not just the other side that is trying to cover up what abortion is.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

We have a lot of people on our side that don't want to show this video. You and I have both gone places to speak on this issue, and we've had to fight for the ability to show the film because the gatekeepers are worried how will people react. And we are more worried about how someone feels about abortion than we are will they actually have one because they don't know the truth of what they're doing.

**FRANK:**

The 1 minute video is at [caseforlife.com](http://caseforlife.com), and I double dog dare anybody to go watch it. If they think that abortion is a right, just watch the video and then ask yourself, should this be allowed? I mean, we could talk about genetics, you know. We could talk about all the all the reasons an unborn child is a human being. But when you see body parts torn up, cut up from every trimester, there's no argument anymore. There it is.

**SCOTT:**

And you're exactly right. In a culture like ours, that, first of all, wants to pretend there is no such thing as objective moral truth, and secondly, does everything it can to deflect from it. It's vital that we do an end run around their semantics and go right to their moral intuitions. And the video does that. Images of abortion convey truth in a way words never can. And that's why pictures show bodies, or teachers in history class show pictures of bodies stacked like cordwood in the death camps of Europe during World War Two. It's not to manipulate students. It's because those pictures convey truth in a way no words ever could. And the abortion issue is no different.

**FRANK:**

One thing the president did say and did get right, Scott, is that the extremists on this issue are not really the conservatives. They are the liberals and particularly the Democrat platform. Tell us what they actually do believe about this issue.

**SCOTT:**

Well, if you look back to going back as far as Barack Obama and even more recently in the House of Representatives, the Democrats voted in lockstep to deny protection for unborn humans who survive abortion procedures. And I just find this ironic, Frank, because these same people are always saying, oh, you pro-lifers don't care about kids once they're born. At least we

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

don't, you know, deny them protection once they're born. The Democrats wouldn't even protect children post birth. So, yeah, they are radical. Trump was right about that.

**FRANK:**

And they are for abortion up to the moment of birth. That's what's going on in California. That's what going on in Colorado, in Michigan. Tragically, I believe that's the case in Ohio now. But the people were sort of duped into voting for that because, as you say, they were given so much misinformation that they thought, oh, well, this is better than the opposite result. How do people? I know it's a big Arizona. First of all, there is an Arizona law, but there's also an Arizona referendum coming up in 2024. What's the truth about that referendum? Do you know?

**SCOTT:**

Well, what the case is right now in Arizona is Arizona is under an 1864 law that largely prohibits abortion. And this was passed during a time right on the heels of the end of the Civil War, where there was a large campaign led by physicians and feminists of all people to outlaw abortion because they viewed abortion as a monstrous moral crime that not only killed children, but victimized women.

And so, doctors, lawyers, and feminists joined together to say, you know what? We're going to get legislation passed based on what we now know about the science of embryology, that from conception forward you have a living human being. And they passed these laws all across the country, not just Arizona. But right now, what happened yesterday is the Arizona Supreme Court upheld the validity of the 1864 law, and that has infuriated pro-abortionists.

**FRANK:**

And we'll unpack that right after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist on the American Family Radio network with me, Frank Turek. My guest today, Scott Klusendorf, of the Life Training Institute, and his book 'The Case for Life' has just been updated. You need to get it. We're back in two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you want to know how to converse on this issue, and on CRT, and on cancel culture, and on communism versus socialism versus capitalism, and intelligent design versus creation, on transgenderism and same-sex marriage, join me for 'Jesus versus the

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

Culture.' The premium version of the course has started, but you can still join because the first Zoom, the live Q&A Zoom session is going to be on April 23, so there's still time.

You also want to join 'Reasons for Faith.' Stephen C. Meyer is going to be teaching a course live for us all the way from Cambridge. And they're going to be, I think, 11 live Zoom sessions for that class, and it's never been taught before. Go to [CrossExamined.org](https://www.crossexamined.org). Click on online courses. You'll see it there. You'll also see how to convince people to be pro-life. You can take the self-paced version that's taught by my guest today, Scott Klusendorf. This is going to be very necessary over the next several months as the nation debates the issue.

Also want to point out we're going to do CIA again, CrossExamined Instructor Academy. It's going to be in Charlotte. You need to apply soon. That's August 1-3, but you've got to apply in the next couple of months if you want to be a part of that. And I've got some events coming up, the Culture and Christianity conference at World Outreach Church in Murfreesboro. That's, I think, the 26th and 27th of April, then the Unshaken conference with me, Alisa Childers, and Natasha Crain in Pittsburgh, PA on Saturday, May 18th. Go to [UnshakenConference.org](https://www.unshakencongress.org).

There is a lot more coming up I'll tell you about shortly. But let's go back to my guest, Scott Klusendorf. We're talking today about what president, former President Trump said. He hopes to be the new president coming up here beginning in January of 2025. He was making comments about the life issue, particularly abortion. And, Scott, we were talking about what's going on in Arizona.

Arizona was not even a state until 1912, but they passed laws in that area back as early as 1864 against abortion. The judges rightfully said, well, it's still the law of the land. It hasn't been overturned. And now there's a referendum coming up in November during the election that I'm sure the pro-abortion side is going to demagogue quite a bit. If you were the pro-life side, Scott, what would you be saying about this referendum?

**SCOTT:**

The number one thing we need to do in all these states, Florida, Arizona, everywhere where there's going to be referendums, there's eleven states coming up in the next year that are going to have these. And we're going to lose all of them, Frank, if we don't get better at puncturing

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

these misconceptions and counterpunching with the truth. We've got to get the word out there that every state that has a law in the books protecting unborn humans allows for there to be surgical intervention in the case of ectopic pregnancy.

And if the mother miscarriages, if the mother has a miscarriage, there is nothing that's going to happen in terms of prosecuting the mother. In fact, the language in these bills or in these laws is very precise. It said the word abortion does not apply to cases involving necessary surgical intervention to save the mother or to miscarriage. So, the language is precise, but our opponents are trying to muddy the waters, and we've got to do better at counterpunching. It's not enough to just tell nice stories. We've got to puncture misconceptions.

**FRANK:**

Gee, I wonder why they're trying to deceive people, Scott. Can't they win out on the merits? Do they have to deceive people in order to get them to vote?

**SCOTT:**

Well, if you're a pro-abortionist, Frank, what's the one thing you want to never have to defend? It's intentionally killing innocent human beings. You want to talk about everything else, choice, privacy, how women are allegedly going to be harmed, how pro-lifers want to take away your birth control devices. And the list goes on and on. You don't want to defend killing children.

**FRANK:**

But they pull body parts out of women when they do an abortion, Scott. So, what are we doing then? We are killing children.

**SCOTT:**

We are. And you know what, Frank? The pro-life movement needs to get more comfortable at playing hardball, showing the reality of what this is. And it wearies me when I go to churches and preach on a Sunday morning, or I do a banquet somewhere, or speak at a school, and they want to join Planned Parenthood in covering up the evil in hiding, the very thing you just described, the pulling out of body parts from the woman's body. They're part of the problem. We need our own people to become truth tellers. And so, I would say to pro-lifers, number one, puncture misconceptions. Number two, quit joining the other side, covering up the truth.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

Now, Scott, I can almost hear people listening to this right now going, what? How can Scott talk about this? He's a man. How do you respond?

**SCOTT:**

Frank, how do you know I'm a man? How dare you judge my pronouns? I thought that's something I get to decide, not you.

**FRANK:**

So, you're identifying as a woman for the purposes of this conversation. Okay, very good. Well, let's move on then.

**SCOTT:**

Move on. I actually did that once when an angry pro abortionist came at me that way. And I asked her very softly, but I said, how do you know I'm a man? And it just ended it right there. But the fact is, arguments don't have gender. People do. By the way, pro-life women like Megan Allman, Janique Stewart, Abby Johnson. You go through the list of pro-life women out there.

**FRANK:**

Lila Rose.

**SCOTT:**

Lila Rose. Yeah, absolutely. They all use the same arguments pro-life men make. And here's the thing. Arguments stand or fall on their merits, not the gender of the person making them. In fact, if Stalin argues that genocide is wrong, it is wrong even if he commits it. The fact that he doesn't live with his own argument does not show his argument is invalid or unsound. It just means he's not consistent. But if we want to really go further on this, Frank, if no man can speak on abortion, Roe v. Wade being overturned should be something everyone celebrates. Because after all, it was decided by who? Nine men.

**FRANK:**

Yeah, Roe v. Wade was. Yeah, absolutely. Yeah. Yeah. It was seven to two. And all men.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**SCOTT:**

All men. So, if no man can speak on abortion, Roe should have been overturned 50 years ago.

**FRANK:**

Parenthetically, I was at a church out in Idaho, and I heard of a young man. He told me this, dealing with the transgender issue in a high school class. And the teacher said, well, if somebody identifies, if a boy identifies as a girl, we have to go with it. And he said, well, what if a boy identifies, say, as an animal? Do you have to go with it? And she said, yes. What if the boy identifies as a deer? Do I have to treat him like a deer? And she said, yes. And he said, well, what if I have a hunting license? Can I shoot this deer? [Laughter]

**SCOTT:**

Exactly.

**FRANK:**

She said, no. You can't do it. He said, because why? I'm supposed to affirm what they are. And she said, out of the classroom. [Laughter] She threw him out. Because of the logic.

**SCOTT:**

I believe it. I guess you could say in that case, the buck stops here.

**FRANK:**

Oh, man. That was a good one. That was a good one. We're here all day for Scott Klusendorf puns, ladies and gentlemen. That was a good one. But, yeah, I mean, it's generally the case that conservatives want to change our desires to fit reality, whereas liberals want to change reality to fit their desires, and they're trying to avoid the issue what is in the womb? Okay, we know what's in the womb.

There's not a raccoon, ladies and gentlemen. There's not a squirrel. There's not a blob of tissue. They're pulling out body parts. Okay, let's now talk Scott, politically, however. And by the way, thank you for those of you that put positive comments on the podcast, wherever you listen to

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

podcasts, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. And those listening on the American Family Radio network, this is a podcast.

So, if you miss it, you can listen to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist.' Anyway, somebody put a review on the podcast, because I talked about how incrementalism is something we ought to try on this issue. And they were really upset, Scott, that I would suggest that if we can't get a complete ban on abortion, if we could save some babies, that's better than saving none. How do you respond to that?

**SCOTT:**

Well, first of all, incrementalism can be an evil when it's used to obstruct protecting all children if you have the votes to protect all children.

**FRANK:**

Exactly. Yes.

**SCOTT:**

But was Wilberforce wrong to withhold his abolition bills in England when he didn't have the votes in Parliament? Was he wrong to work first to abolish the slave trade before abolishing slavery in 1860? Frank, would you have voted for Abraham Lincoln, even though he said that all he would do is keep slavery restricted to the territories and states it was already in? He wouldn't work for a total ban. How about signing the Declaration of Independence? Would you have signed it if you were one of the framers, even though it took the anti-slavery language out of it?

Actually, I would argue that what John Adams did there was absolutely a stroke of brilliance. He recognized that if you didn't draw the slaveholding states into the union, if they remained a separate nation, slavery would go on forever. There'd be no limits on it. But if you pulled them into the Union, the language in the declaration of independence of natural rights would eventually wear down the institution, which is exactly what happened under Lincoln. So, I don't want to argue that incrementalism is wrong in principle. I want to act to save as many lives as I can. While I remain committed to the principle of saving all of them, I will function incrementally until I have the votes to protect all.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

So, Trump has suggested a 15 week ban. I know Ron DeSantis achieved a six week ban in Florida. He knows he couldn't get a complete ban, so he's saving as many babies as he can. Is this wise? Is this unwise? What are your thoughts on this?

**SCOTT:**

Depends on the context. If you're settling on a 15 week ban or even a six week ban, and you're saying that's as far as we're going to go, that in principle, we're committed to only protecting some children and not others, That's a moral wrongdoing. And we can never settle for that as Christians. However, if you don't have the votes to protect all children, you should vote to protect as many as you can, while not giving up your principle of saving all of them. There's nothing wrong with saying right now I don't have the votes to protect all unborn humans. So, I'll do what I can to save as many as I can along the way.

And by the way, the pro-life movement started out on the heels of Roe v. Wade. Trying a frontal assault, they introduced no less than 31 human life amendments and human life bills that said unborn humans were persons with a right to life from conception. Every one of those went down in flames. And then they decided, okay, we're going to take on an additional strategy here. While we remain committed to protecting all unborn humans, we're going to start practicing incrementalism to save as many as we can.

You know, if you're in war, Frank, and you'll know this as a military guy. If you have overwhelming superiority, you crush your enemy immediately, you come in with your M-1 tanks, your warthog fighter planes, and you annihilate them, right? But if you don't, you do what the American Patriots did during the American Revolution. You fight a war of attrition. You slowly chip away at them and keep chipping away at them. And each time you achieve a victory, you come back for more.

So, if your incrementalism is what one author calls smash mouth incrementalism, where you're never going to stop until all are protected. Which, by the way, our opponents know that's true of us. The only ones that seem to get messed up on this are abolitionists who think we're somehow sinning intrinsically, trying to save as many children as we can. And nothing could be

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

further from the truth. Pro-lifers tried the frontal assault. We got destroyed. So, now we're saving as many kids as we can.

**FRANK:**

So, when Trump said he wouldn't sign a national ban, what does that mean? We're going to talk about it more with the great Scott Klusendorf. His book, 'The Case for Life' has everything you need to know about this issue in it. Also, go to [CaseForLife.com](http://CaseForLife.com). Watch the 1 minute video. Watch the 1 minute video. Back in two minutes.

Oh, ladies and gentlemen, if you start talking about abortion, people are going to say, oh, that's your religion you're trying to impose on people. You can't do that. We're going to respond to that in this segment. Don't go anywhere. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek. My guest, Scott Klusendorf, the author of 'The Case for Life' and also the online course, 'How to Convince People to Be Pro-life.' And we need to start doing that, ladies and gentlemen, especially in an election year.

Now, Scott, the president, former President Trump also said that if a national ban were to come across his desk, he would not sign it. Now, this is kind of a hypothetical question, because as it stands now, there's never going to be a national ban, at least in the foreseeable future. So, it's kind of a moot point. But people are trying to back him into a corner, and he said no. He wouldn't sign it. How do you respond to that?

**SCOTT:**

Well, in principle, he must sign it if you are committed to the idea that the unborn have a natural right to life. And the reason why he should sign it is it is not a state's rights issue. Do the unborn have a right to life? It's a federal issue. Because, again, the issue for pro-life is that the unborn have a natural right to life. It is not primarily the state's job to protect natural rights. It's the federal government's job to do it.

That's what we see in our founding documents and in our Founding Fathers. And so, in denying the unborn the natural right to life by saying I will not sign a ban on abortion that protects all unborn humans, he is de facto denying the natural right to life of the unborn. Now, that doesn't mean that voting for Trump wouldn't be a better pro-life vote than voting for Biden, who is

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

going to vote to destroy the unborn wholesale, both here and abroad with your tax dollars. But it does mean the president does not understand the principles undergirding the pro-life view.

**FRANK:**

Yeah, it's kind of ironic, in my view anyway, that the guy who probably, at least personally is least pro-life got the most done on the pro-life issue.

**SCOTT:**

Yeah, it is interesting. He did. Yeah. He was willing to listen to people like the Heritage Foundation, people that gave him a list of candidates and said, here are the people who will uphold what the law says, what the Constitution says, and he got good justices. We need to salute him for that.

**FRANK:**

And the one thing he did get right in that regard is to say that the issue. Well, I started to lose my train of thought on that, Scott. I can't remember where I was going with it. Anyway, let's point out that as it stands now, where I was going with that was the fact that he could have said this if a pro-life ban got to my desk, since I'm all about the will of the people, I would've signed it because obviously, if it gets to his desk, that's the will of the people. So, he kind of contradicted himself in a certain way. You know?

**SCOTT:**

He did. And, Frank, what he did is he forgot that we're a constitutional republic. We're not a pure democracy. Appealing to pure democracy in that speech we heard at the beginning of the show, the will of the people is not the highest good. It's adhering to constitutional principles that are the highest good in the United States because we're a constitutional republic, not a pure democracy.

**FRANK:**

Yeah, thankfully not. It'd be mob rule.

**SCOTT:**

Yeah.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

And some of these legislatures are trying to avoid doing their duty by just, let's make this a referendum. Let's go right to the people. As if the people could decide whether or not somebody lives or dies. As if the people should be deciding whether or not somebody should be enslaved. You know, we put people in place to represent us because they have the time, supposedly, and the expertise to evaluate these issues in a much more robust way, full time, and can come to the right conclusion, rather than a straight democracy where every individual citizen suddenly has to be informed on every issue and vote on all these things.

We're not saying it's the perfect system, but it appears to be better than a pure, straight democracy where you could have mob rule. Now it looks like, Scott, despite the fact that people are making a lot of hay out of this on both sides due to the Dobbs decision, it seems that it's not really a federal issue anymore, right? It's not so much that other than putting justices in place, it's not that Trump, or Biden, or whoever the president is, is going to have a whole lot of say on this issue. Am I getting that wrong?

**SCOTT:**

No. It is true that it is largely a state issue, but here's something to remember. In Dobbs, Frank, the court did not say it's a state's issue. It said the court alone would no longer decide the issue. Roe v. Wade and Dovey Bolton made abortion strictly an issue of the federal bench, period. The legislative and executive branches had no say in the issue.

**FRANK:**

I mean, Trump was right about that, though. He was right that both sides, legal scholars who are fair, realize that Roe v. Wade was judicial activism.

**SCOTT:**

That's correct. He's right about that. But here's the thing. It has not, we are not in a place where there could be or could not be a federal bill that legalizes abortion through all nine months, and the court would uphold that. So, let's say Biden gets re-elected and you end up with a Democrat House and a Democrat senate, which is going to happen if church people don't vote.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Then what could happen is that Congress could pass a bill saying abortion is a fundamental right through all nine months of pregnancy.

They'll call it the I don't know, Freedom of Choice act. Who knows? And they'll put it on Biden's desk, and he will sign it. And that will be the law of the land. All the red states that have passed laws limiting abortion will be undone because federal law supersedes state law. So, we shouldn't think that there'll be states that can keep it illegal to kill unborn children. Not if you have Democrats in charge of the federal government. They will make sure everybody has to be abortion on demand.

**FRANK:**

Well, what about the 10th amendment, though? How does that usurp a state law when you have the 10th amendment?

**SCOTT:**

The same way that Roe v. Wade did. Roe v. Wade struck down the laws of abortion in all 50 states, both conservative and liberal. So, the same would apply, that Congress passes a law. Think about the defense of marriage acts that certain states had passed. As soon as we got an administration that wanted to strike that down, they got a federal court to do it, the Supreme Court. We ended up with the Obergefell decision, and that became the law of the land. Federal law supersedes state law.

**FRANK:**

By the way. This is why the law is a great teacher as well, ladies and gentlemen. A lot of people think whatever is legal is moral, and whatever is illegal is immoral. So, one of the problems that we have after 50 or 49 years of Roe v. Wade is people have come to think, well, abortion is a right, even though it really isn't. Because the law has been in place that long. It's very important, as you well know, Scott.

**SCOTT:**

Yeah. What I do when people tell me abortion is a right, I say, where does that right come from? Very important question to ask. And their first answer will be, well, the federal government said it's a right. Okay, well, then the same federal government, whether that's

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

through the courts or through the Congress that gave a right to an abortion, can take it away. So, you shouldn't be troubled by the Dobbs decision, right?

And then they come back and say, no, it's a fundamental right. Okay, where does that right come from? Fundamental rights need a transcendent grounding point. And as you point out in your book, 'Stealing from God,' the left loves to borrow from our worldview to make its case. And one of the ways they do that is they know they can't pluck rights out of thin air. They try, they appeal to fundamental rights, but they have no basis for them.

**FRANK:**

Let's deal very briefly, if we can, because we're running out of time here, Scott, with the question or the objection. Well, this is just a religious argument. You're just imposing your religion on people by saying abortion should not be allowed. How do you respond?

**SCOTT:**

Two responses, one quick, one more full. The quick one is this. Arguments are sound or unsound, valid or invalid. Calling an argument religious is a dodge. It's a category error, like saying how tall is the number five. You've got to do the hard work of showing where the pro-life argument is unsound or invalid. Outside of that, the argument stands. But on a fuller note, everybody in this debate is doing metaphysics, Frank.

We have two debates or two sides arguing over the same exact question, and neither answer can be proved empirically. One side is arguing that when it comes to the question of what makes humans valuable in the first place, that humans are endowed with value, that it comes from a transcendent source, the way our Declaration of Independence says so. And they view human value as being intrinsic. It's something you have in virtue of your humanity, not some function you can perform.

The other side, the pro-abortion side, is saying, no. Being human is nothing special at all. There is no intrinsic nature that gives you value as a human being. Rather, you're valuable because of some function you can immediately exercise, like self-awareness, or viability, or the ability to feel pain. Until you have those traits, you are not a person with rights.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now notice, Frank, both sides are using philosophical anthropology to answer a metaphysical question of what makes humans valuable in the first place. That question is inherently religious. You can't escape it. So, if the pro-life side is somehow wrong for appealing to the metaphysics of religion, why does the pro-abortion side get a pass when they're asking the exact same question we are?

**FRANK:**

And they're both trying to impose a moral position, ladies and gentlemen. The pro-abortion side is trying to impose death on the baby whenever abortion is chosen. They think a woman has a moral right to kill her child, although they won't call it a child, but that's a moral position. They're arguing from a moral right, whereas the pro-life side is saying, yes. The baby has a moral right to live.

Now, I think, and I think everybody, if we're honest, understands that the right to life is the right to all other rights. If you don't have life, you don't have anything. And so generally, a woman does have the ability to control her body, but not if she kills another body in the process. And that's what's going on, isn't it, Scott?

**SCOTT:**

That's exactly what's going on. You know, it always amazes me when people say, you cannot force your views on me. Why are they correcting me at that point? The only answer they should be giving is complete silence. Because a relativist can't tell me I'm wrong. He can only say he prefers I wouldn't be pro-life. But that's not what we see from the other side. They say we must stop saying abortion is wrong. We must stop taking away a woman's right to choose. Well, says who? If there is no objective morality, who are you to correct me? And who are you to impose that rule on me?

**FRANK:**

We've got a lot more in the midweek podcast, ladies and gentlemen. We've run out of time, but this Tuesday we are going to be with the great Scott Klusendorf again and talk more about these issues. And I'm going to throw some real hard objections at him over abortion. You're not going to want to miss it. So, tune in on Tuesday. Now, friends, it won't be on the American Family Radio network. You've got to find the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

to listen in this coming Tuesday. Check it out. And Lord willing, we will see you right there. God bless. Go to [CaseForLife.com](http://CaseForLife.com).

**CROSS**  
**EXAMINED**  
**ORG**

