

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Censoring the Babylon Bee? | with Seth Dillon

(May 3, 2024)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, what kind of speech does the First Amendment of the United States Constitution protect? And why is the left advocating and actually often achieving censorship? Is it right for the government to urge big tech to censor people on their social media platforms? And some of you may be thinking, well, wait a minute, doesn't the right censor people by trying to ban books in school libraries? Is it ever right to censor someone? And if so, who's going to decide what is acceptable and what isn't?

And what's the difference between regulating conduct and regulating speech? How about these campus protests? Have they crossed the line from free speech to conduct, conduct that should not be condoned or tolerated? And I don't know if you've noticed this, but many on the left seem to want to cancel people rather than debate issues. Why is that? And how does censorship, the censorship trend, affect what your doctor can prescribe, what your kid will learn in school, and what you can and can't see and say online and maybe even in your own company? And how does all this affect satire comedy like The Babylon Bee, my favorite site on the internet right now?

Because The Babylon Bee can make things that we want to say, they can say it in such a way that people will actually laugh and get the point much better than if you just come out and say it directly. And so, my guest today is my friend, the great Seth Dillon, the CEO and owner of The Babylon Bee. He's been on the program before. And for those of you that don't know what The Babylon Bee is, I don't know where you've been living, but just go to BabylonBee.com and you will get a laugh every day, maybe every hour, which is what we need now, because the world's gone nuts. So, here he is, ladies and gentlemen, the great Seth Dillon. Seth.

SETH:

Lovely intro. Thank you, Frank.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

FRANK:

Yes, a very lovely intro. And we're also going to play a clip from you before Congress in the next segment. Last year you were up at Congress actually talking about censorship. Why you? And why were you before Congress?

SETH:

Well, so it was a specific subcommittee that asked me to come there. It was the House Energy and Commerce Communications and Technology subcommittee. It's a mouthful. And they had a panel that they wanted to bring there to talk about what we actually saw in the landscape in our personal experience with big tech censorship and what we thought were the solutions to it.

And so, they asked me to prepare a statement and come ready to answer questions. It was a wild experience it's the first time I've ever been to D.C. for that purpose before, to sit before a committee like that and be grilled, and challenged, and be able to make a statement and talk about our experience. So, I actually, I was expecting more opposition from the Democrats in the room than I got. I was surprised at how easy it was. I wasn't really challenged that much.

FRANK:

Well, we're going to play your statement in the next segment, but that little subcommittee was having a hearing, apparently to get input from people in the know, and you're one of the people in the know. Did you recall anybody on the other side of the issue saying, you know, this kind of censorship is actually appropriate, that big tech is shutting people down? Was anybody trying to really make that case?

SETH:

Yeah. There's another guy on the panel that the primary case is it's not necessarily that they weren't saying that it was appropriate for the government necessarily to be involved, but some of them were. Some of them were suggesting that because some speech is harmful and misinformative, that there is a role for the government to play in making sure people aren't exposed to it. And their main concern was that these big tech companies have a responsibility to the public, for the public's interest, and they have a right, because they have their own speech rights, to decide what's on their platform.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And they have a moral obligation to make sure that we're not misinformed and that we're not subjected to hateful, vitriolic speech that hurts our feelings or something like that. Particularly looking at it through the perspective of trying to protect the marginalized. So, their concern is always for the marginalized and the oppressed and making sure that they're insulated from any criticism or jokes that might, that might hurt their feelings.

So, there was a lot of that. There was a lot of that conversation about how these platforms do have a right and a responsibility, the combination of those things, a right and a responsibility to keep certain speech off the platform. And I do agree with that to some extent. It's a question of which speech and why.

FRANK:

Right. Yeah. To what extent would you agree with that? What speech should not be on any platform?

SETH:

Well, there's already examples. When Elon Musk was talking about taking over Twitter, he was having a conversation with everybody about how his philosophy on free speech, which is that it shouldn't go, if this is the town square, if it's a digital town square, then it shouldn't go far beyond the law in determining what's lawful and what's not. So, lawful speech should be permitted was basically what he was saying. And in a public square, I agree with that. There are certain kinds of speech.

I think a lot of people think that when you're calling for free speech or you're calling yourself a free speech absolutist, that you're saying that anything goes. And that's not really the case because there are current laws that recognize that our First Amendment right doesn't protect the right to explicitly incite violence, for example, or to threaten to murder somebody. There are things that you can't say because they, they threaten the peace, and they are intended to intimidate and harass in a way that could result in real world violence very easily because that's the intention of that speech.

And so, and put people in danger. So, there are specific things that are outside the bounds of what's protected by the First Amendment, and that's already been decided by the Supreme

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Court, and it's already law. There's already precedent for it. Going beyond that, though, to say, oh, well, you know, that's an offensive joke and it hurts the wrong people's feelings. You shouldn't be allowed to say that. Or, you know, what you just said goes against what the CDC says for their guidelines for health.

That shouldn't be allowed. I mean, there's no law against that. That's perfect. That's within the realm of, like, what a healthy debate is, what healthy discourse is. And so, when you start verging off into those areas and saying that that speech isn't permitted, then you have a problem where you're not necessarily dealing with the government infringing on your First Amendment right, but somebody is preventing you from saying things that are lawful to say.

FRANK:

And people, I think, sometimes misunderstand the meaning of the First Amendment. The First Amendment doesn't protect you to say anything you want at any time. What it does is it prevents the government from preventing you from saying what you want as long as it doesn't cross certain lines you just mentioned. You're inciting violence. You're shouting fire in a crowded theater when there is no fire. Yeah, we get that. That's not the kind of speech that is protected.

Interestingly enough, people don't seem to realize that the First Amendment does not protect obscenity. In other words, according to the Founding Fathers, the government could prevent you from putting pornography online. because that is not. Well, online, obviously, that didn't happen in the 200 years ago, 250 years ago. But in the public square, pornography was never protected under the First Amendment when it was written.

Now, maybe they've reinterpreted that to say it does now. But there were types of speech that the government could censor, but not the kind of speech that you're being censored at The Babylon Bee for. In fact, before we go to the break, give us a quick 45 second overview of what happened to The Babylon Bee on Twitter prior to Elon Musk taking over.

SETH:

Well, yeah, so the history of our censorship is things like being flagged for misinformation. We've had jokes that were fact checked and rated false, and then we were threatened with

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

deplatforming and demonetization if we continue to spread fake news. So, that was really kind of where it started back in 2018 because the social media companies were criticized heavily for being responsible for Trump getting elected.

And so, they're like, how can we prevent this from happening again? Well, we can crack down on the misinformation that made it possible for him to get elected, which is apparently Babylon Bee jokes. And so, you know, they started fact checking our jokes and then it got to hateful conduct. And that's what happened on Twitter was, we misgendered Admiral Rachel Levine and got kicked off for that, so.

FRANK:

Well, we're going to dive more into that right after the break.

You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio network. My guest, the CEO of The Babylon Bee, the great Seth Dillon. Much more right after the break. 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 never going to hear this on NPR.

What we're talking about is censorship today with my friend Seth Dillon, the CEO of The Babylon Bee. And this is the headline that got The Babylon Bee in trouble with big tech, March 15, 2022. Here's the headline. "The Babylon Bee's man of the year is Rachel Levine." Now, who is Rachel Levine, ladies and gentlemen? Well, he used to be Richard Levine and went through some sort of transition. I don't even know if he actually went through it, but they, was it USA Today? Who, who named him woman of the year? How did this go, Seth?

SETH:

Yeah, so what happened was, you know, we live in clown world, as you know. And in clown world, you see crazy headlines, real headlines that feel like satire. And we woke up one morning to USA Today having published a headline that said their pick for Woman of the Year was Admiral Rachel Levine. And we're like, what is this? Really? Seriously? You've got a man in a dress, and you're saying that this is the person that you selected for Woman of the Year?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

There wasn't a better woman out there, like, a real woman that you could have selected? It had to be a man who's pretending to be a woman? It felt like parody. It's the kind of thing that would have been a comical joke, you know, just a matter of a handful of years ago, a decade ago. And so, it was funny.

We were trying to think about ways to satirize this, because typically, you know, what you have to do is exaggerate the real story to successfully do a satirical write up of it. And we're like, we can't exaggerate this. This is like, straight out of a South Park episode. There's no way to do that. One of our writers suggested that we just name Rachel Levine our pick for man of the year and encounter it that way. And Kyle, our editor in chief, replied to me. He goes, dude, you're going to get us kicked off Twitter and Facebook.

And Joel, the guy who pitched the idea, goes, ha ha. Yeah, I know. And I say this a lot when I do talks on this subject, I always make this point because this is a crucial point. That dialogue that my writers had about that, about making that joke, they were being lighthearted, and they were laughing, you know, like, haha, we're going to get kicked off. But it was a serious concern. When they're writing jokes now, they're not just, like, thinking, oh, is this funny? They're also thinking to themselves, am I going to get us kicked off social media with this joke?

They want you thinking that way. They want you thinking about how, and when I say they, I mean the big tech platforms themselves, the powers that be, right? The cultural and institutional powers that be want you thinking, will there be a penalty for this? Probably. Therefore, I shouldn't say it. That way, you end up censoring yourself and doing their work for them. They don't even have to take your content down, which is hard censorship.

They're relying on you to engage in your own soft censorship, where you just zip your own mouth shut so that you don't have any penalty or consequences. And there are real world consequences for saying things like that. You can actually lose your platform. In our case, at the time, we had 1.5 million followers. And so, it's like, you know, there's a big cost to giving that up. We joked about getting booted off Twitter, but we knew that it was a very real possibility that we could and that it would be very costly for our business.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And so, we did have a strong position on the issue of self-censorship, though I've always told my writers, you know, like, we are not going to cater to this. And our job as satirists is to push back on this overreach, this tyranny, and mock it, and make fun of it, and do our best to thwart it and defy it. And so, what we're going to do is tell the jokes we're not supposed to tell, come what may.

And so, we posted this thing, and very quickly, it started, you know, getting some traction and reaction. And the trans activists were mass reporting it, and we got a notice saying that we violated the hateful comic policy. They wanted us to take it down or else we would never be able to tweet again. And so, we refused to do that. And then, you know, the rest is history. Elon Musk got involved and bought Twitter, and restored us and a bunch of other accounts, and declared comedy legal again. So, we're grateful to Elon for that. We owe him \$44 billion now. But that's the story in a nutshell.

FRANK:

Yeah. In fact, you have interacted with Elon on a number of occasions. You've done a couple interviews with him, and I remember you quoting him in such a way that he's quite obviously an extremely bright man. But what he said about censorship, I thought was one of the quotes of the year, certainly, and I can't recall it. I don't know if you can off the top of your head, but it had to do with the fact of what you just said, that you're allowing, when you self-censorship, you're allowing them to win, and we just can't do that. It's tyranny.

SETH:

Well, you're doing the tyrant's work for him when you censor yourself. That's the way that I put it. And so, I encourage people. I'm like, the only way to win this fight is to refuse to do that. You know? Make them engage in hard censorship and shut us all up forcibly. Make them do that. Don't give them the easy way out where they actually get to control your tongue without even having to lift a finger. That's not right. Then you're just. Yeah, go ahead.

FRANK:

So, this blew up so much that it made it to the halls of Congress, where, Seth, you went and spoke before the subcommittee. So, we're going to play your five minute, testimony here because you say a lot in a short period of time. I think this Elon Musk quote is actually in this

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

talk you give, if I'm not mistaken. And you're speaking like Ben Shapiro, because you got five minutes to make this happen. So, let's play the clip. Here it is.

SETH:

I want to start by thanking this committee for giving me the opportunity to speak today and for the willingness of its members to address this important issue of censorship. My name is Seth Dillon. I'm the CEO of The Babylon Bee, a popular humor site that satirizes real world events and public figures. Our experience with big tech censorship dates back to 2018, when Facebook started working with fact checkers to crack down on the spread of misinformation. We published a headline that read, 'CNN Purchases Industrial-Sized Washing Machine to Spin the News Before Publication.'

Snopes rated that story false, prompting Facebook to threaten us with a permanent ban. Since then, our jokes have been repeatedly fact checked, flagged for hate speech, and removed for incitement to violence, resulting in a string of warnings and a drastic reduction in our reach. Even our email service suspended us for spreading harmful misinformation. We found ourselves taking breaks from writing jokes to go on TV and defend our right to tell them in the first place. That's an awkward position to be in as humorous in a free society.

Last year, we made a joke about Rachel Levine, a transgender health advisor in the Biden Administration. USA Today had named Levine Woman of the Year, so we fired back in defense of women's sanity with this satirical headline, 'The Babylon Bee's Man of the Year is Rachel Levine.' Twitter was not amused. They locked our account for hateful conduct, and we spent the next eight months in Twitter jail. We learned the hard way that censorship guards the narrative, not the truth.

In fact, it guards the narrative at the expense of the truth. All the more outrageous was Twitter's lip service commitment to free expression. Twitter's mission, they write, is to give everyone the power to create and share ideas and information and to express their opinions and beliefs without barriers. As promising as that sounds, it rings hollow when you consider all the barriers that we and so many others have encountered.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

The comedian's job is to poke holes in the popular narrative. If the popular narrative is off limits, then comedy itself is off limits. And that's basically where we find ourselves today. Our speech is restricted to the point where we can't even joke about the insane ideas that are being imposed on us from the top down. The only reason Twitter is now an exception is because the world's richest man took matters into his own hands and declared comedy legal again. We should all be thankful that he did.

The most offensive comedy is harmless when compared with even the most well-intentioned censorship. I hope we can all agree that we shouldn't have to depend on benevolent billionaires to safeguard speech. That's a function of the law. But the law only protects against government censorship. It hasn't caught up to the fact that the vast majority of public discourse now takes place on privately owned platforms.

So, where is the law that protects us from them? The lovers of censorship will tell us that there can be no such law. The Constitution won't allow it. But they're wrong, and their arguments fail. I only have time to deal with a few of them very briefly. One, they say private companies are free to do whatever they want. That's nonsense, especially when applied to companies that serve a critical public function. A transportation service can't ban passengers based on their viewpoints, nor can telecom providers.

Under common carrier doctrine, they're required to treat everyone equally. That precedent applies comfortably to big tech. The argument that only the government can be guilty of censorship falls short because it fails to make a distinction between the way things are and the way they should be. If these platforms of the modern public square, as the Supreme Court has described them, then speech rights should be protected there, even if they presently are not. The current state of affairs being what they are, is not a good argument for failing to take action to improve them.

But beyond that, these platforms have explicitly promised us free expression without barriers. To give us anything less than that is fraud. Two, they say these platforms have a First Amendment right to censor, as if censorship were a form of protected speech. But it isn't. Censorship is a form of conduct. The state has always been able to regulate conduct.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

The idea that censorship is speech was forcefully rejected by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in their recent decision to uphold an anti-discrimination law in Texas. The court mocked the idea that buried somewhere in the enumerated right to free speech lies a corporation's unenumerated right to muzzle speech. No such right exists, and how could it? The claim that censorship is speech is as nonsensical as saying war is peace or freedom is slavery.

Three, they say these platforms are like newspapers. They can't be forced to print anything they don't want to. But they aren't like newspapers. They aren't curating every piece of content they host, and they aren't expressing themselves when they host it. They're merely conduits for the speech of others. That's how they've repeatedly described themselves, including in court proceedings, and that's how section 230 defines them.

As a final point, I think it's important to acknowledge that the call for an end to censorship is not a call for an end to content moderation. Some will try to make that claim, but section 230 gives these platforms clearance to moderate lewd, obscene, and unlawful speech, and anti-discrimination legislation would respect that. The only thing it would prevent is viewpoint discrimination, and such prevention would not be unconstitutional because it would only regulate the platform's conduct. It would neither compel nor curb their speech. Thank you.

FRANK:

Seth. What is the difference between regulating conduct and regulating speech? Because you make that in your talk before Congress. What is that difference?

SETH:

Well, yeah, and I was talking specifically about the conduct of censorship, which is making the decision and taking the action to say, okay, well, your speech is acceptable. His speech is not. I'm going to take that down. When someone is doing that, they're engaging in, that's an action. It's conduct. It's not a message that they're communicating. They're simply choosing which speech to allow. Speech is a message. You're communicating a message. You're articulating a viewpoint.

Conduct is when you engage in some kind of behavior, like when you look at what's happening with the protesters on these campuses, and we start talking about whether or not they're

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

speaking and exercising their First Amendment right to express themselves, or whether they're engaging in some kind of conduct that shouldn't be permitted where they are. Well, there's gray areas in some cases, but some cases, it's very clear.

If you're obstructing somebody's past, that they can't get to their classroom just because they're Jewish, that's a form of conduct, not speech. And so, it's very easy in many cases to distinguish between someone's message, a political message or viewpoint which is protected and should be allowed in someone's conduct, which doesn't always need to be protected. In fact, sometimes it infringes on other people's rights.

FRANK:

And we're going to unpack that further right after the break. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. My guest, Seth Dillon, of The Babylon Bee. Back in two.

Welcome back to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek on the American Family Radio network. I want to mention the CrossExamined Instructor Academy, CIA, a training program we run for three days every year. We've been doing it since 2008. This year it's going to be in Charlotte, North Carolina at Central Church of God. If you want to be a part of it, you need to go to CrossExamined.org. That's CrossExamined with a D on the end of it.org. Look on events. You'll see CIA. You have to apply.

It's a small group of people, under 100 people will attend because not only will we present to you, you will present to us. So, it's a real presenter and Q&A training program. And it's not just me that will help you do better at this. We'll have Greg Koukl, we'll have Alisa Childers, we'll have Natasha Crain, Allen Parr, Brett Kunkel, Jorge Gil. Many others will be your instructors for three full days here in Charlotte, North Carolina. So, go to CrossExamined.org. Click on events. You will see it there.

My guest today, the CEO of The Babylon Bee Seth Dillon. Seth, as we played in the last segment, testified before Congress last year on censorship. And we were drawing the distinction before the break between free speech and conduct. What is the difference between speech and conduct? And, Seth, you've noticed, and finally, Columbia University noticed that it wasn't just

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

speech anymore on Columbia University, and the same thing at UCLA. What were some of these so-called protesters doing that went beyond speech?

SETH:

Well, I think anytime you're, well, there's codes of conduct on these campuses for the students. You know, there's certain things that you can and can't do: obstruction, destruction of property, trespassing after you've been asked to leave, or trespassing into an area that you're not allowed to be in, for example, a building that's closed and it isn't supposed to be occupied at that time. There's a lot of things, including intimidating and harassing other students, that amounts to a form of conduct that isn't just speech.

It's one thing to stand there with a sign or even a bullhorn, although in some cases that's prohibited conduct, to stand there and say what's on your mind, articulate what you believe and why you believe it. Allow other people to also stand there and say what they think and oppose you. That's all perfectly normal protest behavior, that's acceptable speech. But all the examples that I just mentioned, these protesters have set up camp on the campus and are living there.

I thought this was really comical when they started demanding humanitarian aid because they were going to starve and die of thirst if someone didn't bring them food and water. And it's like, you can get up and leave any time. No one is forcing you to be in the conditions that you're in. In fact, you could probably order Uber eats right now and have a meal delivered to you within, like, 18 minutes.

So, I just thought that was hysterical, the way they're kind of, like, cosplaying or, like, role playing as these oppressed people who are confined to this area without food and drink. It was just mindless. But anyway, that's beside the point. We can mock them for that. But the speech versus conduct thing, I think there's, yeah. Are there some weird gray areas you can get into? Sure. But generally speaking, I think there's very clear distinctions between conduct that shouldn't be permissible and speech that should be protected.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

FRANK:

In fact, The Babylon Bee right now, the headline as we speak, 'History Repeats Itself as Communists Run Out of Food.' That's the headline. The Communists are these protesters at Columbia and UCLA, and they're saying, we need food. Help us. We need humanitarian aid. I love this other headline that was just from a few days ago.

' Hamas Thanks College Student Supporters by Promising them a Quick Death During the Global Intifada.' [Laughter] Seth, why is it. And it's all part of the Marxist worldview. But why is it that these people, many of them, consider themselves very supportive of, say, the LGBTQ movement? Why would they ever align themselves with Muslim terrorists who would be the first people to throw them off a building if they were in Gaza?

SETH:

Well, it's not about consistency, obviously. And it's not about truth, either. I think it's about what's useful politically. It comes down to what's useful politically. And what they find useful is looking at the world through that socio-cultural Marxist lens of oppressed versus oppressor. But this isn't even their fight. You know? They're not oppressed. That's why they're pretending to be oppressed is because they're not actually oppressed. They are enraged and protesting on behalf of someone else who falls into the oppressed oppressor scheme as they view the world.

And so, it's not about defending their own rights. I think you actually have a little bit more leeway to engage in civil disobedience if you're doing it in defiance of tyranny that's cracking down on you personally. If your rights are being violated in some way and you're pushing back on that, there are measures that you can go to, I think, that are more justifiable than if you're just simply saying, well, somewhere else, somewhere in the world, it's happening.

And so, I'm going to act out in rage and throw a tantrum right here where I am. I think that's kind of, that kind of pushes the boundaries of what's reasonable to some extent. But no, it's definitely not about consistency or truth. They're not trying. They don't care if you call them out for a double standard. It's all about what's useful politically. That's what it comes down to.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

FRANK:

And you actually, and friends, you want to follow Seth, certainly on X, we don't have to call it Twitter anymore. But look for Seth Dillon on X because I was reading your feed earlier today, Seth, and you actually quote a young woman, Elika Laban, about exactly what you just said in terms of these people are role playing the idea that somehow, they are oppressed, like people in Gaza. And it's really just hard to believe they would actually do this.

But part of it is tied up, as you mentioned, in this kind of neo-Marxist worldview where everybody is in two categories, oppressed or oppressor. And yet they are trying to make it seem like they have some sort of solidarity while they go to a \$70,000 per year tuition school in New York City and have zero personal oppression. It's like they have this, this rich guilt somehow, that they somehow need to take on an oppressed role.

SETH:

I don't know. Is it zero? They got hungry. No one delivered the lunch. [Laughter]

FRANK:

That's because according to one of your user people at The Babylon Bee, one of your subscribers, their headline was, 'Students Starve Because Grubhub Couldn't Find Tent' or something like that on the quad, I mean.

SETH:

But the worldview, though, that's being, that we talk about the Marxism, you know, in this woke, it's woke moral reasoning is the way that I call it, in the woke moral reasoning. I don't remember if we talked about this last time I was on the program, but woke moral reasoning essentially says, for the oppressed, all things are permitted, all things. And then they will decide who's in the oppressed category.

Well, Hamas is oppressed. Therefore, for Hamas, all things are permitted. What they did on October 7 was perfectly justified because their resistance is justified. When people are occupied, they are oppressed. And so, they have the right, the moral right and authority to go out and slaughter innocent women and children in their beds as they're sleeping, because anything is justified if you're oppressed.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And that woke moral reasoning is so depraved and distorted, it doesn't actually deal with whether or not an action is right or wrong in any objective sense. It just simply asserts that if you are oppressed, you're right. And if you are, if you're in a position of strength and are deemed the oppressor, you're wrong. No matter what your intentions are, no matter what you're trying to do, and no matter whether or not you are actually right or wrong, you just are, by default, wrong.

And so, it doesn't matter what Israel does or says, they're wrong. It doesn't matter what Hamas does, they're right. And so, the danger of woke moral reasoning is that it can result in really bizarre, and strange, and depraved conclusions. You reach very depraved conclusions. And I applied it. I mentioned this earlier, too. It applies to every conversation. It applies to the abortion discussion and whether or not, you know, life should be protected. When you take woke moral reasoning and apply it to that topic, you end up with, well, an unwanted pregnancy is like oppression.

The woman's womb is colonized. It needs to be decolonized, and resistance is justified by any means necessary. And so, then you end up justifying the murder of an innocent, defenseless baby because the baby is unwanted and is occupying territory that it shouldn't, the woman's womb. And so, her resistance is justified when she's occupied. For the oppressed, all things are permitted.

So, unwanted pregnancy is oppression under the woke moral scheme. And so, it justifies all kinds of unspeakable evil and atrocities. And it does so in the name of what's moral goodness. And it's just, it's unbelievable to me how many people have been infected by this. This is why it's called the woke mind virus. It infects your mind, and it makes you believe that these things are morally good, when they're actually atrocities. They're reprehensible.

FRANK:

In fact, you do have a retweet on your feed. And again, check out Seth Dillon at X Twitter, because you're following some people that actually articulate so much of this in not just an opinion way, but with stats behind it. You've actually retweeted something from the pollster Frank Luntz. And you noted in there, Seth, that the older generations side with Israel because Israel is correct here, not just because they're blindly following Israel.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Yet when you get down to people who are, say, 18-25, it's almost split. It's like 57 to 40 something, 40-43 maybe. If I remember the stat correctly, the younger people, as you put it, have the woke moral virus, or however you put it. What did you call it?

SETH:

I said they're more susceptible to the woke mind virus. I think that's what I said.

FRANK:

Woke mind virus, which involves morality. Why is that? Why are the young people? Is it because they're going to these woke institutions that we are actually sending our kids to these places? We are paying, in some instances, 70 grand a year to have them infected with this nonsense.

SETH:

They're not well educated. They're being miseducated. They're being indoctrinated for sure. Young people are more impressionable, for one thing. And layer on top of that, the intentional, the deliberate miseducation of them, the indoctrination of them. And, yeah, you end up with a lot of young people who are adopting these crazy views. I find it insane that parents, a lot of the parents of these young people disagree with their kids.

The kids come out of college with totally, radically changed worldviews, and the parents are left thinking to themselves, what happened to my son or my daughter? You know, I just spent north of \$100,000, maybe a couple hundred thousand dollars to send them off to an indoctrination institution that turned them, that infected them with the woke mind virus. And now they're literally defending Osama Bin Laden and Hamas. I mean, that's what you end up with if you end up sending your kids to these schools.

FRANK:

And what's the alternative? We'll talk more right after the break with Seth Dillon, CEO of The Babylon Bee. Follow him on X. Make sure you check out The Babylon Bee every day as well. In fact, become a subscriber. I am back in two minutes. Don't go anywhere. Headline on The Babylon Bee, April 28, 2024. Kristie Noem clarifies, Killing Puppies Makes Up Only 3% of What She Does. What does that mean? Well, Kristie Noem is the governor of South Dakota, and she's

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

run into some controversy recently, and The Babylon Bee is making fun of it. Seth, what's this all about?

SETH:

So, I guess what happened was she published a book. And in this book, she tells a story. This is an event that happened a while ago. Apparently, it was years ago. She had an unruly dog on her ranch. They had apparently taken it off someone else's hands because it was too aggressive, and it ended up being aggressive with them, too. This is a 14-month old dog, basically a puppy. I guess it's not fully developed, but it was a little too aggressive and had attacked some animals and had bit her or something.

So, she put it down. She shot it, ended its life because it was a disruption on her farm. And she told this story, I guess, not expecting that people would be upset about that. But our culture is such that we value the lives of dogs more than we value human life, I think. You don't mess with puppies in America. You mess with puppies, and you get people very upset at you. That's the one way that you can ensure you're going to get everybody on the right and the left equally upset at you as if you shoot dogs.

So, she stepped in it, and now she's been dealing with the fallout from that. And the point that I wanted to drive home when everybody was getting so mad at her for ending the life of this dog is that imagine if we were, as a culture, as a society, imagine if we responded to abortion the way that we respond to a puppy being killed. We would have abolished abortion a long time ago because it would be so politically toxic to say, I'm in favor of that. Imagine a politician just coming out and saying, you know what? I'm in favor of killing puppies.

I think that if they're unwanted, you shouldn't have to. If your dog gets pregnant and there's a litter of nine puppies in there that you don't want them to be born, take your dog outside. Shoot it, put them all down. You would never have a political career. You couldn't get elected anywhere. It would be completely toxic. Well, imagine if that were the case, if that was your stance on human life.

Why do we value puppy life more than we value human life? So, we took an opportunity to take a few jabs at her over that. And also, just this idea that somehow dogs, and I'm not suggesting

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

that we shouldn't care about dogs. I'm saying that we should at least care about humans as much as we care about dogs, shouldn't we? At a bare minimum.

FRANK:

Right, of course. And the 3% comment is a great sort of inside joke for people that don't know. At one point, Planned Parenthood tried to say that abortion is only 3% of what they do.

SETH:

Yes. It was their way of downplaying it and putting it in context and saying, well, you're all worked up because we do abortion here, but it's only a small percentage of what we do. As if a serial killer could say, you know what? I may have killed 18 women over the years, but that was only a small fraction of all the things I did in the last 18 years. I did a lot of other stuff, too.

FRANK:

That's right. It would be like an attorney saying about his client on, you know, about to be persecuted or about to be prosecuted, I should say, for that kind of crime. Yes, my client did kill 18 people, but keep in mind all the people he didn't kill. [Laughter]

SETH:

Right, exactly. He met hundreds of people, and he had a job, and he went to church, and he did all these other things, too. Like he had other activities on his plate. So, yeah, the reasoning there is just mockable.

FRANK:

It's, you know, just the other night at Citi Field in New York, The New York Mets had \$1 hot dogs. You know, normally when you go to a baseball game, the hot dogs are, like, exorbitantly priced. Right? But it was \$1 hot dog night. They sold, I think they sold 44,000 hot dogs that night.

SETH:

Wow.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

FRANK:

And they were only there only, like, 20,000 people there. That would be like. That would be like the New York Mets saying, hey, baseball is only 3% of what we do. We sell a lot more hot dogs than playing, you know, than getting hits in baseball. It's just completely misinformation to say that. And that's what Planned Parenthood does, ladies and gentlemen.

They're just one big institution of misinformation. If we're going to make a case for censorship about misinformation, it should be Planned Parenthood. It shouldn't be people who are coming out and making valid points like The Babylon Bee does in a humorous way, or like doctors do on the COVID vaccine. But yet that's where we are in America.

SETH:

Well, and that is such an egregious use or misuse of misinformation. You know, when you're spreading misinformation for the purpose of devaluing a human life so that it will be not just legal but considered morally acceptable to end it and kill it. That is, you know, that's misinformation that's being used for just diabolical purposes. It's not just politically expedient or harmless.

It's actually because this is the word that they use all the time to describe the misinformation they don't like. They always put the qualifier, harmful misinformation. You know, you're spreading harmful misinformation. Well, how can you get more harmful than misinformation that devalues life so that it, can be justifiably ended? I mean, that's as harmful as it can possibly be.

FRANK:

Lila Rose, who heads a pro-life organization, tweeted just a day or two ago "In Florida, the Heartbeat Act has gone into effect today. The law prohibits the murder of Preborn children once their heartbeat can be detected. This will save approximately 50,000 children from being killed by abortion every year." Well, Vice President Kamala Harris said this about it.

"As of this morning, 4 million women in Florida woke up with fewer reproductive freedoms than they had last night. This is the new reality under a Trump abortion ban. And Seth Dillon,

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

our guest today, said this, "Democrats always think it's a dark day whenever babies are saved." Why is that, Seth? Why are they now the party of death?

SETH:

It is a pro-death culture. And that's the thing is that we need to, that's ultimately the change. Those laws are great. That law will save lives. I wish it could save more than it's going to. But the problem isn't that we're, I think oftentimes the criticism of pro-life people is that, you know, we're too pro-life. You know, we're hurting ourselves and our electoral chances because we're taking too hard a line on defending life. And I think the problem isn't that we're too pro-life, it's that the culture is too pro-death.

And so, exactly that you see a situation like that where you have somebody, she's not ashamed to go out there and say it should be as shameful as saying, I love killing puppies to go out there and say that she's mourning the fact that children are going to be born. She's mourning that. She thinks that's a bad thing and that should be politically toxic. Our culture is too pro-death. We need to go back and change that. We don't need to compromise on the principle that all life is sacred and become less pro-life. We need to change the culture so that it's less pro-death and more pro-life.

FRANK:

Yeah. Think about this, ladies and gentlemen. People think the way out of their problem is to kill their own children. That's their solution. In order for me to not be inconvenienced, I need to kill my own children. And there are now, and there's now an entire political party that is getting behind that. And it used to be, I want abortion to be safe, legal, and rare. Now it is shout your abortion. Come to our state. We'll pay for it, I mean.

SETH:

That's when I say, that's why I say pro-death. Yeah. That is actually, it's gone beyond just, you know, this is something that should be rare and isn't necessarily right, but there's these really tricky and extenuating circumstances. We have to be sympathetic and whatever. The tone of the whole argument has shifted to we're going to use the euphemisms and call it reproductive rights. We're going to call it health care.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

We're going to say that this is a good thing that must be preserved. And anybody who so much as approaches it with criticism needs to be absolutely destroyed. So, they're very protective of their pro-death culture, and they're very successful at advancing it because they're so good with the language. If you read Kamala's tweet about that, I still call them tweets. I can't call them X posts.

FRANK:

Yeah, you're right. If you read her tweet, what did she say? Millions of women are losing reproductive freedoms. So, I mean, freedom is a great thing, and you want to preserve freedom.

SETH:

Right? But freedom to do what? You've got to get the euphemisms out of the way. And that's how they advanced the pro-death culture is by shrouding it in euphemisms. And this is what I say, Frank, all the time. I'm like, you don't whitewash something unless you know it's dirty. They cover it up with euphemisms because they know it's wrong and they have to conceal what they're actually saying and standing by.

FRANK:

Well said. Yes. People are whitewashing something that's dirty by covering it up with words that we ought to agree with, like freedom, and equality, and choice. And all these words, by the way, are all stolen from a Christian worldview. And as my friend Jay Richards says, what they try and do is weaponize our compassion against us. Weaponize our compassion against us by saying, oh, you ought to be compassionate.

You ought to be for freedom. You ought to be for equality, you ought to be for choice. You ought to be for all those things because you're a Christian. Right? But they're using them in a way or in a context where we ought not be for. You ought not be for the freedom to murder your own children. Right? That's not a freedom you want or should want anyway. You shouldn't want that freedom. And yet, that's what they call it.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

SETH:

And it isn't justified by saying that you have bodily autonomy or that you shouldn't be inconvenienced. I think a newly born infant is so much more taxing on a woman's body and psyche than a preborn child. Once the baby's born, that's when the work begins. That's when you lose sleep and are constantly having to care for that child and sustain, and nourish, and protect that child.

It is a round the clock, tireless, thankless job that completely infringes on your freedom to just go do what you want. You can't go party. You can't be out late. You can leave home, but you've got the baby with you, and so you're doing things that you can only do with a baby in tow. Right? So, your freedom is greatly circumscribed by the existence of that child. Is that justification for killing infants? Of course not.

FRANK:

No. But that's what they say. You know, we've got so much more to cover on the censorship issue and the abortion issue and how censorship affects your doctor, your kid, your school, what you can say and can't say, and see online. We're going to cover it on the Tuesday midweek podcast. For those of you listening on the American Family Radio network, it will not be on AFR. You've got to find the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast. Do so, and Seth and I will see you then. God bless.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

