

What Every Christian Needs to Know About Economics and Transgenderism with Dr. Jay Richards

(December 27, 2024)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure you've heard of the 80/20 rule that 20% of what you do can give you 80% of your outcome. And there are just a few essentials that make a big difference. For example, to be healthy, what are the three things you need to do? Well, you've got to eat right, you've got to get enough sleep, and you've got to exercise. And of course, then don't do things that'll degrade your health, like drink too much, or smoke, those kind of things. What do you got to do if you want to win a football game? Well, you've got to block. You've got to tackle. And the coach will always say, we can't turn the ball over.

What are the three fundamentals of real estate? Yes. Location, location, and location. Well, what we try and do here on this program, as you know, is we try and give you the essentials of what you need to know. Because I don't know about you, but we live in a world of information overload. There is so much information coming at us, particularly from our iPhones and our Droids, that we can get just befuddled. We don't know where to turn. We don't know what to do. We don't know what the right information is. There's so much misinformation out there that you sometimes can't figure out what the right thing to think is.

Well today, we have a guest with us, one of our favorite guests who is really good at boiling things down. He writes great academic works and popular works, but he can really communicate on some very important issues, the essentials of what you need to know. So, here in our last couple of podcasts of 2024, we want to give you the benefit of my friend, Dr. Jay Richards. And Jay's been on the program several times before. He was just on a couple of weeks ago talking about his brand-new updated book, 'Privileged Planet'.

But we want to cover several topics in sort of rapid fire order over this podcast and maybe the next topics on issues that Christians may be confused over. And so, Jay's going to give us some essentials. We'll also recommend some books he's written that can help you go further. So,







here he is, ladies and gentlemen, the great Dr. Jay Richards. Originally, he's worked in so many different areas. He's a graduate of Princeton University. He's worked at the Discovery Institute.

He's worked at Catholic University. He is now working with the Heritage Foundation, doing some great work on the transgender issue. And Jay, it's always great to have you on. You know, one of my favorite books of all time, I mean certainly in economics is 'Money, Greed, and God'. Now, you wrote that book, what, 2013?

JAY:

2009 originally, and then a new addition in 2019.

FRANK:

Yeah, so there was a 10 year anniversary. We did a couple of programs on it over the years. But let's talk economics first, Jay. What are the basics of economics? Let's just start right there.

JAY:

All right, so people that have had an econ class, usually micro or macro in college, think that it has to do with how to figure out the kind of supply/demand curves and stuff. It's actually mostly a way of thinking. And so, Thomas Sowell, the great economist, is really good. He said, so the fundamental principle is that scarcity is real. So, in other words, you can't have everything you want. Another one of Sowell's points is sort of distilling this is that there are no solutions. There are only tradeoffs. That's an exaggeration. But the idea is that every choice is a benefit and a cost.

And so, you're constantly kind of figuring out, okay, how do you sort of balance that in anything you do, right? Assuming it's not an intrinsic evil, you want to make a choice that maximizes the good and minimizes the cost. So, that's a basic reality. So, if there's scarcity, that means, okay, there's not enough stuff. There's not enough services to go around so that everybody can have absolutely what we want.

And so, then the question is, okay, what's the best way overall to distribute goods and services? And there's just a couple of different ways to do this. And I would say a fundamental truth of economics is that a free ranging price system is overall the best way to distribute goods and







PODCAST

services because it allows people maximum amount of information without having to know everything about the system.

And it allows everyone to kind of individually sort of decide their own tradeoffs. Really, the only other alternatives would just be law of the jungle, right, where you just steal stuff and have wars. No price system really there. Or state socialism where the government owns all the private property, and they dictate all the prices of everything. And that's, you know, those are sort of the live alternatives. And then in terms of thinking economically, I always quote the great economic journalist, a guy named Henry Hazlett, who wrote this wonderful book, I think in the 50's called 'Economics in One Lesson'.

Here's what he said. He said the art of economics consists in tracing the consequences of a policy, not merely for one group, but for all groups. In other words, you don't just say, gosh, it'd be really great to raise the minimum wage to \$200 an hour, then everybody would be rich, right? Well, you're assuming that, right? You're assuming the consequence. But what would really happen if you raise the minimum wage to \$200 an hour?

Answer. Nobody whose labor is worth less than \$200 an hour is going to have a legal job. That's what's going to happen. And honestly, if people can only remember one thing when you're thinking about an economic policy, if they can just remember for anything that's proposed to say, and then what would happen?

What would happen if we did that? And then the good news is that everything along these lines has really been tried. And so, you can usually find out what will happen if you attempt that policy and then just forget your good intentions, because economic policies have effects irrespective of what you intended for them to do. Those are the kind of basic things. But as you mentioned, 'Money, Greed, and God' is really built around these eight myths that people bring. So that, for instance, the idea that if one person gets rich, that causes someone else to get poor.

And if that's true, you know, it has all these sorts of consequences. And then I have an essay that people can Google, and I hope it's free online. It's in the journal 'Markets and Morality', called 'What Economists Know, Believe, and Debate'. And it's what, at least by my lights, the 30







PODCAST

most important truths that economists know and that we all should try to commit to memory if we really want to understand economics. And that's good news because it means you don't have to have a graduate degree in economics. In fact, that might cause you problems if you just kind of learn to integrate economic ways of thinking into your analysis. Just like if you're doing apologetics, you want to know something about logic and standards of evidence and stuff like that.

FRANK:

Now, the Bible presupposes private property when it says thou shall not steal. Beyond that, though, Jay, does the Bible, in your view, advocate any one sort of economic system?

JAY:

Well, not exactly. I mean, but it's, you know, obviously the Bible's not an economics textbook. But as you said, I would say that if you can derive the principles from Scripture and from Christian theology that are consistent with, let's just say, a kind of free economy and limited government, whatever you want to call that, a free market economy, and are inconsistent with socialism. And the big one is what you mentioned, private property.

So, of course, really two of the Ten Commandments. So, you know, don't steal. That implies people have a right to certain things that ought not to be taken from them. And then don't covet the property of your neighbor. So, that implies that even kind of wanting something that rightly belongs to someone else. If something rightly belongs to someone else, then that means that there's a type of property that's appropriate, Right? And shouldn't be removed from people unjustly. And then I would say definitely limited government. And so, I mean, it's funny when the Israelites are of course, begging in Judges for a king and you know, and you get finally Samuel, and they get a king.

And the warning, right, is, okay, here's what God says. You're going to get a king, but he's going to take your stuff, he's going to conscript your children and your sons for war, and you're not going to like it, but you're going to get one. And it's so funny because, you know, it's a sort of terrifying vision. And yet, the claim of what the king is going to do is small compared to what the federal government does in terms of sort of controlling our lives and our economy.







PODCAST

So, just the idea that, okay, there's a government, it ought to do certain things. It ought not to do other things. So, it should be limited by families, by churches, by civil organizations, just by society as a whole. You get that, limited government, private property rights, and then just some things you discover, like the function of prices, and you get more or less a free market economy. And you absolutely don't get socialism, which involves the state ownership of all property.

FRANK:

Now, our government has become so bloated. And since this election, we had a little over a month ago, a lot of people are excited that people like Elon Musk and Vivek are going to try and get in there and pare things down. Why has our government got so bloated in your view?

JAY:

Well, it's... And I don't even think you have to attribute it to bad motives. I think it's because of a series of decisions in the 20th century in which more and more things move from either the private or voluntary sector into the political sector. So, for instance, I mean, if you think a couple hundred years ago it wouldn't have occurred to anyone that the central government, that is the federal government, should be involved in things like housing, or should be involved in things like healthcare, quite frankly, or should be involved in education.

These were either local or state concerns. And yet over time, all of these things have ended up agencies in the federal government, in the executive branch and administrative agencies. And the problem is, is that as I said, there are things the government is supposed to do, but there's a lot of stuff that when the government does it rather than someone else, it actually makes things work.

FRANK:

And we'll see some of that right after the break. We're going to talk about economics. We're going to talk about a whole number of other topics with my friend Jay Richards trying to give you the essentials of what you need to know. You can go deeper, but we'll do more of that just after the break. Don't go anywhere. Back in two. What we try and do here on I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist is give you the essentials of what you need to know. You can go a







PODCAST

lot deeper. If you want to go a lot deeper into economics, please get 'Money, Greed and God' by my guest today, Dr. Jay Richards.

We're just scratching the surface here, but we were just talking about before the break how our federal government got so bloated, and it was probably with good intentions, Jay, but it's gotten out of control. Why is the government involved in housing? Why is the government, the federal government, why is it involved in education? Why?

JAY:

Well, because these are all sort of political and social concerns or things that people have and the populace. And frankly, elected officials don't follow that art of economics rule. They don't think fully through the consequences of different policies. And so, for instance, we talk about the massive blow to the federal government. What most people don't know is that the large sort of growth areas are actually in what's called non-discretionary spending and what's so-called entitlements.

And it's things that everybody sort of likes and a politician gets unelected if they challenge it. But we're talking about Medicare and Social Security, basically. Medicare and Social Security, the budget is determined not by how much revenue the government's taking in, but literally by how many recipients there are for these programs. Now, when they're set up, Social Security, for instance, when it was set up in the 30's, something like 43 people were paying into Social Security for every one retired person that was receiving it. Right? So that's sustainable.

You have this kind of retirement program to help people after they're retired. Now, it's basically two and a half people working to every one recipient. So, it's completely unsustainable. And this is in part because people continue to live longer. And yet the minimum age or the max, you know, the minimum age for receiving it has stayed the same over the years. Same thing with Medicare. Look, we want the elderly to have access to affordable health care, especially late in their lives when they're dealing with a lot of that stuff.

But the system we have is really, really inefficient. And so, it does not maximize for quality, and it doesn't maximize for price efficiency, unfortunately. So, two programs, put them in place and then just the kind of way the system is set up, it distorts the incentives. And Frank, this is in







PODCAST

some ways kind of the most, another really important thing to understand about economics is if you want to say, okay, how did this political or social problem happen? Why are we having this problem and how do we fix it? It almost always involves the incentives.

So, are the incentives distorted? So, if you tell drug companies, okay, you can't be sued for injuring people with your vaccine. Now is that going to make them more careful or less careful? If they know they can be sued down to the studs, they're going to probably act in a certain way. Right? But if they're told, oh, no, actually you can't be sued as long as the FDA approves your drug, you're not grossly negligent, nobody can sue you for vaccine injuries. Oh, and by the way, we'll mandate your drug so that people have to take it.

You see how that changes the incentives? A natural market would actually take care of that. But when you add these kind of political considerations, you totally scramble the incentives. And that's almost always the answer in, in these kind of policy questions. Now the question is, okay, so what's politically saleable that would actually solve it? That's always the tough stuff.

FRANK:

Yeah, and we don't necessarily have an answer at this point, but when you have two and a half people paying in for every one person and it came from 43 to one, you know, we have a problem somewhere. You know, Ben Shapiro said this not too long ago, that back in, I think, 2005, President George W. Bush wanted to privatize some of Social Security and put it in the stock market. And everybody balked. If we had actually done that, a lot of our problems would be solved right now.

JAY:

Absolutely. And poor Paul Ryan, who finally retired. I mean, he came to Washington, this was his goal, totally well meaning. He thought, we're going to reform entitlements, not to destroy them, but to make sure they're available to people, you know, long term. But it's just impossible to talk about it in Washington.

And so, nobody does. And so, my worry is that it will only be when the problem manifests itself directly that we'll be able to do anything about it. And it's much harder to solve the problem, you know, five years from now than it would have been to solve it 30 years ago.







PODCAST

FRANK:

So, Jay, as Christians, we should all be concerned with taking care of the poor. Of course, Jesus talked about that. For some reason in our country, we've seemed to have put that particular responsibility off on the government now to do so rather than individual Christians. In your view, from a governmental perspective, what is the best way to help the poor, economically?

JAY:

Yeah, the best way by far to help the poor and everyone else is to maintain the rule of law in a regulatory environment in which wealth can be created, in which new businesses can be created, in which lots of different kinds of jobs can be created. Because societies do not become wealthy. Right? Poverty, at least sort of society wide, is not alleviated by specific government funds or, you know, programs.

It comes from the private sector. And of course, the government has something to do with that because it kind of creates the political conditions for that. But you should really think of the economy. It's like the fields in the Old Testament in which, remember, the Israelites are commanded, okay, you're farming.

You've got, say, a wheat field or barley. Leave some gleanings around the edge of the fields for the sojourners, so the poor that are walking through, they'll have something to sustain themselves. But notice, you can't have gleanings if you don't have a harvest. That's where the alleviation of poverty primarily comes from.

And then you think about, okay, so it's an emergency situation for the people that fall between the cracks. The problem is, is that we now, rather than having what I think insofar as you can, you want to devolve that more and more to local control, whether it be churches individually or at least towns where people are closer to the situation. Instead, we've got, and this sounds crazy, something like 80 means tested welfare programs. This is a massive giant Shelob's lair spider web thing that traps people in generational poverty.

In fact, my colleague Robert Rector at Heritage, he's probably the world's expert on this and just almost no one understands the complex interactions of all these different means tested







welfare programs. The result of it is it tends to reward people that have children out of wedlock and punish them if they get married to the parents of their children.

And it tends to incentivize people to stay on the system rather than helping them to get out. As it's often said, we don't want a safety net. We want a sort of safety trampoline that just kind of helps people get back. The problem is, the more centralized a solution you have, the more the sort of people trying to help the poor have to treat individuals as generic humans as opposed to dealing with their concrete problems.

FRANK:

Yeah, unfortunately, we've created a safety net that people are using as a hammock.

JAY:

Yes, exactly. That's why I think if it's a hammock and it's a sticky hammock. It's like a giant spider's web in which people, you know, if you talk to a lot of people that are in the system, they don't like it. It's not like they're like, oh, yeah, this is great. They would really like to get out of it, and they're generally rational and just know that my options are not great, and I'm going to lose this if I do that.

And so, I think so much of this, Frank, you can actually understand without even attributing bad motives to people. Sometimes people do things for evil reasons, but a lot of times people do things for what they think are good reasons, and it's still harmful either to themselves or to other people.

FRANK:

Well, it's interesting when we look at what the Bible says, particularly in the Old Testament, when, as you said, Jay, leave the corners of the field unharvested so sojourners and poor can harvest some crops for themselves. When they did that, they had to work for that. They had to go harvest the corners of the field. It wasn't just given to them.

JAY:

Exactly. It wasn't like going to the corner of the village and there's going to be a granary and you just sort of get some. They still had to actually pick it. That's a really good point.







PODCAST

FRANK:

So, we want to incentivize people to help themselves, to help them help themselves. And it doesn't really work when we have incentives in place. And that's a key point, Jay, incentives. People do things based on incentive rather than typically what is right.

When they have incentives to not form a family around themselves, keep the man out of the house so I can get more and more welfare. That's a perverse incentive. Has anybody at Heritage or anybody anywhere come up with a solution to this? Because it's a hard problem.

JAY:

It is. And again, I would just refer to my colleague Robert Rector, who in fact he was one of the gurus behind the 1996 Welfare Reform Act. Which remember, that's 1996. So, that's Bill Clinton. Bill Clinton is president. But he had a Republican Congress at that point, and he signs the Welfare Reform Act. It was actually just reforming one program, one of the means tested welfare programs. Everybody said, oh, okay, it's going to increase childhood poverty, it's going to increase single motherhood poverty, it's going to increase abortion. All those were false.

Abortion actually went down. It improved single women's welfare, and it improved the children of single women. But the good news is that it actually helped, and we've got the data to prove that. The bad news is it was only one program that got reformed and there's so many of them that, you know, it's great if you can fix once or one hole in the dike, but there are a bunch of others unfortunately.

FRANK:

Now, give us a quick overview of the difference between socialism and free market capitalism. Because even in the debates, you know, Trump was calling Kamala Harris a Marxist. You know, what does that even mean? And of course, you know, Harris said, you know, he's just a rich billionaire. He didn't care about you. Give us kind of an overview of this.

JAY:

The gist of it, basically you can distinguish what you want. You said free market capitalism. That's fine as long as people don't have a kind of mental image that's bad in their minds and, or it's what I'll call state socialism like the Soviet Union, the early form of the Soviet Union in





I don't have enough FAITH to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

1920's. So, a free market system, you have a free price system. That's the key thing. So, goods and services, the prices that are attached to goods and services reflect the underlying supply and demand of the thing. So, in other words, prices tell you something about economic reality underneath. And if you have a free ranging price system, that means you have a limited government.

So, the government's not dictating prices. It's allowing people to buy and sell. That kind of sums it up. If you've got that, then you know you're going to have private property, you're going to have limited government, you're going to have probably really good banking and titling system, all these kind of things you need. The state socialism is the state owns everything on behalf of the people.

So, there isn't private property as we would imagine it. You have collective farms; you have collective factories. And then the government just determines what prices are going to attach to different goods and services, quotas for how much is going to be produced, and all that kind of stuff. So, it's really, are those decisions for those things pushed down so that there are individuals, and families, and firms making those economic decisions about prices and production? Or is it a government entity using the coercive power of the state to decide those things?

That's a really kind of basic way of thinking of it. And notice in neither case, you're not talking about anarchy over here. Right? So, sometimes kind of socialists will act like the alternative is something where it's just a free for all in the law of the jungle. That's crazy. That's not a free market system. You have to have the rule of law in order to have the kind of rudiments of a free system. The question is, how are prices determined? Who's getting to determine what is sort of bought, and sold, and produced, and not produced? Is it those individual actors, or at least actors of the private sector, or is the course of state dictating all those things?

FRANK:

Now, there's a great section in 'Money, Greed and God' you've got to read, ladies and gentlemen, on this about not only is there nobody at Apple that knows how to build an iPhone, there's nobody in the world that knows how to build a pencil from scratch. And we'll unpack that a little bit after the break. Then we're going to move on to another topic. Remember, we're







PODCAST

trying to do sort of a little TED Talk here from my friend Dr. Jay Richards on economics right now. Then we're going to talk on transgenderism, because Jay is leading the charge to bring sanity back to that issue, particularly for the young.

So, don't go anywhere. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Merry Christmas, Happy New Year. We're back in just two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

What are the essentials of some important topics that you need to know to cut through the noise you get over your iPhone or on your computer every day, or from your Uncle Harry at Thanksgiving or Christmas dinner? You know, how can you really know the truth about these issues? We can't go into a lot of detail, but we're trying to give you the essentials of knowing about economics. At least here in this first couple of segments we've done.

We're going to move on to transgenderism in a minute. We're talking to my friend Dr. Jay Richards, who's written some fabulous books on so many topics. So, the one we're talking about right now is 'Money, Greed, and God'. And Jay, in the book you give this great example of the fact that no one knows how to build a pencil. And there's so many lessons that come from this. Give us an overview of that.

JAY:

Absolutely. And of course, I'm recapitulating the famous story by Leonard Read, of the Foundation for Economic Education, this little story he wrote called 'I Pencil'. And the point of it is that in a market in which there are price signals so people can buy and trade freely, we are able to create things that none of us could create on our own.

And a pencil is genius because that seems so simple. But of course, you know, there's rubber or some kind of synthetic rubber. There's copper, there's all the details of the ingredients of the paint. There's the wood which has to be harvested right in process. And then there's the graphite, which, I mean, does anybody know how to mine graphite? I mean, I don't even know where those are.







PODCAST

FRANK:

Jay, how do you get it in the wood?

JAY:

I know. How do you get it in the darn wood? I have looked this up and there's two halves. They have to put it together. And so, the point is, is that there's all these amazing things that are all the result of human activity, and action, and ingenuity, but not one. It's lots of people coordinated in a certain way.

And it's really a magnificent thing that I think that we honestly don't marvel enough at it. And so, in the book I said okay, but that's a pencil. So, let's just talk about, in 2009, I called it 'I iPod'. So, I focused on the supply chain for what was called the iPod, which nobody knows about anymore because I had written it at the end of 2007. And so, gosh, I just zero in on almost any component of that is more complex than a pencil. And then, in the 2019 edition, of course I did 'I iPhone'. And it's just absolutely mind boggling, the supply chain.

This is the glory of a market. Now, does that mean there are no tradeoffs? There's no cost? No, of course not. It doesn't mean that you get Utopia if you have global trade. And you might say, okay, look, I don't think we should be trading freely with our chief adversary, China. Great, let's have a conversation about that. But if we don't trade with somebody, that's going to have an economic cost. And so, really the question, economics or economists can't tell you whether you ought to trade with someone. They can tell you, okay, what's likely to happen if you don't?

Well, you'll probably increase the price for some things, but sometimes, look, you decide for national security reasons, it's better not to trade. But if you close off trade like, you know, with all of your neighbors, for instance, I mean, like even think of the 50 states, let's say that all 50 of the United States of America decided they weren't going to trade with anyone outside their borders.

We would all be extraordinarily poor by modern standards. And if you don't get it, just imagine if you had to make, and sell, and build, and grow everything in your neighborhood or just in your house, on your property, right? At some point you realize, okay, you're limiting the options







PODCAST

so dramatically. And so, markets allow us to do amazing things that we could not possibly do on our own.

FRANK:

And it's an invisible hand, as Adam Smith put it. Can you just describe what he meant by that?

JAY:

Yes, absolutely. And I think that Smith, probably he thought of the invisible hand as a kind of form of God's providential guidance. But what he was talking about was the fact that you can be working on something, and you don't even actually know what the result is. Like maybe you're in a graphite mine or you're working in a paint factory or something like that, and you're working for your ends. It may be, okay, I need to pay my rent, I need to buy my daughter braces, right?

You're not thinking about, oh, I'm going to help build a pencil that's going to go to a first grader, you know. That's the ultimate end. And so, this idea of the invisible hand is that under certain conditions, what he called the naturalist system of liberty, people can be working toward their own sort of narrow interests, and yet they will participate in a process that creates value for themselves and for other people that they don't know anything about, as if there's a hand guiding it toward this end, even though none of the human participants actually necessarily know about the end.

It's a remarkable thing. It doesn't happen automatically. This is not the law of the jungle. When he's talking about the natural system of liberty, he meant a kind of benign system in which people can have businesses and not get stolen from and not get murdered and not get enslaved. When you have that, this remarkable system allows us to create things that none of us individually could do or even necessarily know about.

FRANK:

So, Jay, how does this show that a top down approach, like a socialistic or a communistic system where somebody in the government is making all the decisions, how does this show that that can't work, that that's going to be economically inefficient?







PODCAST

JAY:

The simple answer is that there is no one or no community of people that can possibly know precisely what the price for something ought to be at a particular moment. And so, when the Soviet Union tried doing this, for instance, they just specify, okay, this factory, you're going to get this amount of money for producing this many square meters of glass.

Well, that incentivized them to produce glass as thinly as possible, which is basically useless for everything. It's because they were going along this one metric. Whereas in a market economy, what's happening is that entrepreneurs, and businesspeople, and customers are constantly thinking, okay, what precisely am I willing to pay?

What are my competitors willing to pay for this thing? And entrepreneurs are trying to meet that. So that in a market system with prices, this is an informational system in which information is being transferred and distributed throughout the system, even though no one person has it.

And in a system in which, say, the government arbitrarily decides prices, they're just literally making stuff up because they don't know what the prices ought to be. And so, when people say, oh, I don't really believe in a free market system, I say, okay, so you want an economic system in which the price system doesn't tell you the truth about the economics?

I mean, that's really the choice. Do you want prices to approximate the truth about underlying supply and demand or do you want that to be irrespective of that? In which case you're going to get total chaos, you're going to get massive shortages that the kinds of things the Soviet Union discovered to its demise.

FRANK:

So, if you want to drive people into poverty, ladies and gentlemen, use some sort of socialistic, communistic, or top down system where people can't make their own choices and vie in the marketplace for what they want. And look, we could talk for hours on this, but we don't have hours. Get 'Money, Greed, and God'. There's so many great insights in that book. Jay, I want to transition to another topic that you've been working very hard on.







PODCAST

In fact, there's even a profit motive in this, and that is to transition children who don't really have the capacity to know what they're doing. First of all, how has transgenderism surged in the past decade, and what's going on with the current legal battle that you're leading actually?

JAY:

I mean, it actually, it really is a surge. And some people may have heard Robert F. Kennedy Junior's speech endorsing Trump on August 23rd. He talked about a massive epidemic of chronic disease among children, and he was talking about medical, physical disease, and mental illness. Well, the massive increase in gender incongruence or gender dysphoria among kids.

In other words, this idea that kids are extremely uncomfortable and distressed over their sex bodies. This is a massive problem. And it went from a very rare condition, mostly among young boys, to majority girls. Enormous number. Let me give you just one number, Frank. So, in the UK, there's one pediatric gender clinic called Tavistock Gender Identity, or GIDs. So, it's one big clinic. It's since been closed for these functions. And from 2009 to 2019, so it's one decade, the percentage of girls being referred to that clinic for treatment surged by 4400%.

No, I'm sorry, 44,000. So, 44 times the increase. So, 44 times more girls in a single decade. Now, what happened during that decade? Well, a particular idea got popular. The iPhone, which we talked about. It came online in 2007, and kids suddenly had access to this kind of crazy idea that they might be born in the wrong body. And the way to fix that was to transition. First, they change their name and pronouns in bathrooms, and then if they're young enough, get puberty blockers, and then cross-sex hormones, and then finally, gender transition surgery.

And this has been happening across the free world in the United States, really kind of above all countries is the free for all, because you've got 79 pediatric gender clinics now in the United states. You've got 600 Planned Parenthood clinics, basically, almost virtually all distributing cross-sex hormones, mainly to girls. It's an uncontrolled experiment on our children. It's an outrage. As you know, I actually changed my career trajectory to work on it. That's the bad news. The good news is that I think we're winning this fight.

The Supreme Court just heard a case called Scrametti about the gender medicine bill in Tennessee. I'm optimistic about how that's going to turn out. That public opinion has flipped







PODCAST

completely on this. We know that something like 3 to 5% of undecided voters right at the very end of the electoral season moved toward Donald Trump because of this issue. And so, I think we're going to win the gender medicine fight. I think we're going to close these clinics. I think they're going to get sued into oblivion.

The hard work of a generation, the worldview work, is to get the idea out of people's heads that they might be born in the wrong body.

FRANK:

What does the Bible say about that?

JAY:

I mean, just open to the first page. You know, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. Of course, He creates everything around us. On day six, He creates the land animals. And then there's an encore on day six where He, you know, He stops, and He speaks to Himself. Let us make man in our image after our likeness, male and female, He created them. And then He blesses them and commands them, be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it.

And the text goes on to kind of elaborate what that means. This is a fundamental reality. It's a theological truth that God made us for each other. The reason that we have marriage is that's the social institution that recognizes and ratifies this biological reality, this reality of human nature that takes one fertile male and one fertile female to reproduce after our kind. Now, that institution is always under attack. The idea, though, that there are males and females and that males, you know, or the idea that males can become females or vice versa, this is the kind of new idea, and it's a radical idea that really, basically our bodies are kind of meat suits.

What we really are is this internal sense of gender called a gender identity. And sometimes those get stuck in bodies that are different from our sex assigned at birth. And so, the way to fix that, it's not to adjust your mind to your body, it's to adjust your meat suit, right? Your body to fit your gender identity, which is supposedly the core of who you are. This is a completely insane hall of mirrors, philosophically, that falls apart on even superficial inspection. And yet this is the idea that has captured virtually all of our major medical associations in the United States, unfortunately.







FRANK:

It is crazy. I write about this, ladies and gentlemen, in 'Correct, Not Politically Correct: About Transgenderism and Same-Sex Marriage'. You can check that out. Jay, you have a lot of resources on the web. Before we go to break, where do they go to get resources on this issue?

JAY:

So, a couple of great sources. If look at my stuff, of course at colleagues at heritage.org. But also go to SEGM, it's the Society for Evidence Based Gender Medicine, SEGM.org. And then there's another website called biologicalintegrity.org, a lot of good stuff.

FRANK:

BiologicalIntegrity.org. We'll unpack that and put it in the show notes right after the break. Don't go anywhere. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. My guest, Dr. Jay Richards of the Heritage Foundation. He's great on a lot. We're going to talk about other topics as well. So, don't go anywhere. We're back in just two minutes.

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. We're using the 80/20 rule here on this podcast. We try and do that on a lot of podcasts actually, ladies and gentlemen. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. My guest, Dr. Jay Richards.

We've been talking about economics; we've been talking about transgenderism. We get right back to Jay in a minute. I just want to mention that as you make your final year-end donations, please think of Cross Examined, if you would. I know many of you do already. We're 100% virtual. A hundred percent of what you give goes to ministry, 0% to buildings.

By the way, whenever we go to a college campus, we've got several coming up this coming spring. Whenever we go to a college campus, it's completely free to the students. The people who are paying for the event are you, and there are no charges to the students.

So, if you want to reach people on college campuses with I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist and all the Q&A we get from that, then please go to CrossExamined.org. Click on







donate. It's tax-deductible and you will see a link there for that. You'll also see our address. If you send us a check or a money order, it'll save us the credit card fee. But credit card donations are fine as well as we're coming up to the end of the year. Thank you so much for giving. We've got a lot of results, good results this past year just on social media.

We've impacted people 110 million times in 2024 and a lot more on the radio that we can't measure, a lot more on TV, we can't measure a lot more across the world we can't measure because we've set up websites and we put out social media that we can't track quite yet in 15 different languages. So, thank you for all the support. We're using Kingdom AI to do that, as you might know. Thanks so much for what you're doing to reach people through us. Again, CrossExamined.org. Click on donate.

Let me go back to my guest, Dr. Jay Richards. Jay, we've been talking about economics, we've been talking about transgenderism. We're trying to give the essentials. What would you say are the top three things people need to know about this whole transgender movement?

JAY:

The first is that it's a crazy ideology that really just emerged in the last few decades that denies basic biology. So, they've never used the word sex. They'll never refer to the reality male and female. They instead talk about a thing called a gender identity that they'll define circularly.

And then they treat sex as a social construct. They'll talk about sex assigned at birth. The second thing is that we know, historically, from the 20th century that the vast majority of children that have gender incongruence have these feelings, if allowed to go through natural puberty, those will resolve those feelings.

So, in other words, for most kids, puberty itself actually solves the problem. The third thing is that these affirmation treatments, so-called gender affirming care, almost never make any positive difference. Not only are they physically destructive, but they don't actually solve the psychological distress. And if people doubt that, I encourage them, just Google detransitioners or read a couple of great books by my friends.







Jennifer Lahl has a book about detransitioners, and Mary Margaret Olohan has a book all about detransitioners. So, these are young people that went through the transition pathway, got somewhere down the path and then realized that it was a tragic mistake. And honestly, it's because of kids like that, that I got into this because I just thought, okay, we've got to at least limit the damage so that kids, if possible, aren't permanently harmed by these procedures.

Because sometimes it takes five or 10 years for people struggling with this to realize that, oh, actually making myself look more like the opposite sex didn't really, that didn't actually solve the problems that were inside me.

FRANK:

How much of a profit motive is involved here from Big Pharma?

JAY:

Well, it's definitely involved now. I mean, some people, my friend Jennifer Billock, who I think she's a Marxist and so she tends to think it's all about that. It's just kind of a capitalist conspiracy. I don't think that's true. I think it started ideologically, it started among academics, the idea worked its way in. And then once this...

So, it's really, it's the Dutch protocol that is this social transition, puberty blockers, cross-sex hormone surgery, that pathway, once that became a kind of preferred treatment, then all of a sudden there's a massive drug incentive. And so, now of course, if you've got somebody that tries to transition to the other sex, they are a lifelong patient for your drug. And so, there's no doubt that there's a financial incentive now in place. Although I think that was a lagging phenomenon. I don't think that's what caused it to start with.

FRANK:

And over in Europe, they've closed these gender clinics down because they're being sued to the point that they can't remain open. True?

JAY:

Well, and so actually there are lawsuits underway in the UK but like the Tavistock Clinic, that was primarily the result not of the famous lawsuit by Kira Bell, which did sort of raise the







PODCAST

profile, but it was the work of pediatrician Hillary Cass and her Cass Report, which was actually just released now several months ago. This is a 388 page report analyzing the benefits or lack thereof of these procedures, accompanied by something like seven systematic reviews of the evidence in the, in BMJ that just concluded that there's just very poor to no evidence that these, these procedures actually do what they're supposed to do, that they actually help kids.

And so, now the UK has effectively put a stop to this. But the same thing is happening in Finland, and in Sweden, and in Denmark. And I think there's hope for France, and maybe even Germany as well. I think that in the next few years, most of the countries that started doing this will have quit doing it. And at the moment we're actually lagging behind in the United States.

FRANK:

And you're working very hard on this at the Heritage Foundation. So far, 23 states, if I'm not mistaken, have laws against it?

JAY:

It depends on how you count. It's about 25, though some of those bills are not great. But basically, half the states in the country now put some kind of restrictions on these procedures and there are major lawsuits underway. My general theory is that one massive settlement with an insurance company or a gender clinic in favor of a detransitioner, and that's going to increase the malpractice insurance for these procedures, and then it'll just make it economically impossible to do them.

FRANK:

Now, Jay, we're going to continue our conversation in another podcast, but I want to start that conversation right now with an objection. People will say, well, you Christians, you ought not be involved in politics like this. You're imposing your religious viewpoint on people. What do you say to that?

JAY:

Well, everybody has a viewpoint. And the point about living in a republic is that we're allowed to bring our views into the public square, to vote, and to try to influence other people through rational persuasion. And so, Christians are in exactly the same position as anyone else.







PODCAST

presume that if you're an atheist or a secular humanist, you have views that you articulate and defend as well.

That's what it means to live in a democratic republic. And so, this idea that if you're a Christian, somehow you have to sort of privatize your convictions, it's nonsense. And it's not anything that anybody applies to themselves.

FRANK:

No, they do not. That's certainly not the case. It is a worldview issue, however. Where did this world view come from to say that I am in the wrong body? Where does that even originate from, other than Satan himself?

JAY:

Yeah, okay, so it's a very complicated question, but the simple summary is that it is a combination of critical theory, which is a kind of cultural Marxism applied to ideas rather than economic structures, French postmodernism, a type of radical kind of postmodern feminism in the United States, and then a weird kind of Gnosticism, which treats us not as embodied creatures, you know, unique compound or hybrids, you know, fully spiritual and fully material beings made in the image of God, but rather we're just these kind of subjective selves, psychological selves, trapped in bodies. It's really a form of Gnosticism, but it's a weird kind of high tech 21st century Gnosticism.

FRANK:

Yeah, and it's... I mean, I saw a clip from a Senate hearing the other day. It was on school, or I should say collegiate sports. And Ted Cruz was asking some proponent of having biological men in women's sports this question. He said, why do we have women's sports at all? Which is a great question!

JAY:

The question, yeah, all they have to do is identify as a woman in order to compete in women's sports. What is women's sports, exactly? I mean, no one even knew what, as if this category of gender identity was the reason we separate men and women. We separate men and women because on average, men are much stronger and faster and are dangerous when competing







PODCAST

against women in certain kinds of sports. And everybody knew this until the day before yesterday.

And now, we're not supposed to sort of point out the obvious. But if you think just because this guy says he identifies a woman he can compete with against women, why wouldn't we just dissolve the distinction and just have everybody compete, male or female? Nobody wants to do that.

What we're really getting is we're getting men that are mediocre athletes when they're competing against other men, switching over and then being quite successful for obvious reasons. And so, I do think a lot of this, it's not just poor guys that are gender dysphoric. I think there's a heck of a lot of just exploiting the ridiculous situation.

FRANK:

Yeah. Can you imagine LeBron James playing in the WNBA?

JAY:

It's insane! Everybody knows this. That's crazy. [Laughter]

FRANK:

It is. Jay, where can people go to get more? Give us some more websites so people can go a lot deeper, and we'll put them also in the show notes, friends. And we're going to continue our conversation in the next podcast. But give us some more of those websites that people can go to for some of these issues.

JAY:

Gender stuff, definitely, SEGM.org, BiologicalIntegrity.org. If people want my real time opinions, they can follow me on X, formerly known as Twitter at @DrJayRichards.

FRANK:

JAY?







PODCAST

JAY:

It's J A Y Richards. Exactly. FRANK: @DrJAYRichards. Check that out. Also get his book, 'Money, Greed and God', ladies and gentlemen, fabulous book on economics. It will shatter so many myths that you might have on economics and give the biblical viewpoint on economics.

So, you definitely want to get 'Money, Greed, and God.' Make sure you get the latest edition, came out in 2019. And we've also done several podcasts on this program. If you go back into the archives, which you can only do on the Cross Examined app, by the way. I think Apple only keeps up podcasts for about two years. But if you go back, if you get the Cross Examined app, two words in the App Store, Cross Examined. Go to the archives. Probably 2019, 2020, you will search, just search for Jay Richards. You will see 'Money, Greed and God' right there.

And you'll definitely want to get that book, especially for young people who are very idealistic about, rightfully so, about, you know, trying to bring the poor up and all that. The best way to bring the poor up is actually written about in 'Money, Greed and God'. And you'll want to check that out. Jay, it's always a pleasure having you on. Thank you so much. JAY: Thank you, Frank. Good to be with you.

FRANK:

All right, that's Dr. Jay Richards, ladies and gentlemen. Tune in on the Tuesday podcast. For those of you who are listening on the American Family Radio Network, you will not hear that on AFR. You've got to check out the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast, and you will see Jay there.

You'll also see all the other podcasts we do midweek. It comes out on Tuesday, so go to wherever you get podcasts. Look for I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. Join us there and we will see you here, Lord willing, next week. God bless.



