

The Absence of God Is the Big Issue

There's a reason the first openly bisexual senator did not take her oath on the Bible. There's a reason that an atheist website rebuked me for "misgendering" someone. Simply stated, to embrace the God of the Bible means to embrace His standards. To reject the God of the Bible means to reject His standards. Conversely, to reject His standards is to reject Him. This is really not rocket science.

Breitbart reported that, "Newly elected Arizona Sen. Kyrsten Sinema refused to be sworn in on a Bible, opting, instead, to place her right hand on a book of laws, including the U.S. Constitution and the Arizona Constitution."

It is no coincidence that she is our first openly bisexual senator as well as the only member of the Senate who has no religious affiliation.

This doesn't mean she is a terrible person or has no moral values at all. And it doesn't mean she cannot serve the government. Of course not. There is no religious test for leadership either way. (In other words, you can't be disqualified for being a Christian or disqualified for not being a Christian.)

But it does mean her lifestyle and identity are at odds with the God of the Bible, hence her lack of religious affiliation and her refusal to swear in on the Bible. That is perfectly consistent.

Over at the "Friendly Atheist" site, a site which is certainly atheistic if not always friendly, Sarahbeth Caplin wrote an article titled, "Christian Writer Deliberately Misgenders Trans Woman to Defy 'Social Madness.'" She accuses me of "faith-based bigotry masquerading as Christian love."

As for one of the websites which published my article, she said this: "The folks at *Charisma* are eager to start off the new year with yet more doses of the only things they have to offer: fear-mongering and anti-LGBTQ bigotry." (See [here](#) for my article.)

The truth be told, it is not bigotry to affirm biological realities, and the average transgender activist does not have science on his or her side. (By this I mean that the average person identifying as transgender is clearly of one biological/chromosomal sex but identifies as the opposite.)

Yet an atheist website that certainly claims to be rational and science-based embraces transgender activism with enthusiasm, vilifying those who reject it. Why?

And why is it that, according to a Pew Research poll, 92 percent of American atheists support same-sex "marriage"? Or, according to this same poll, 87 percent of these atheists believe that abortion should be legal in most or all cases?

A recent article by Sally Hunt on the Friendly Atheist website critiques the video arguments of pro-life atheist Terrisa Bukovinac. Hunt writes, "I watched [the video]. I'm not convinced. And that's because it seems abundantly clear that the atheist 'pro-life' argument is identical to the religious one, except Bukovinac didn't invoke 'God' throughout the monologue. Both arguments are logically flawed, though. An atheist who opposes abortion essentially says Abortion should be illegal because of my feelings, while a religious person would say Abortion should be illegal because of my feelings, which also happens to be what God wants."

Obviously, Hunt misrepresents why Bible believing Christians so strongly oppose abortion. It's not that we have our feelings, which happen to be what God wants too. Instead, we are convinced by God and His Word that the baby in the womb is a real human being, and therefore we align our feelings with

the Word.

Hunt, however, rightly represents the atheistic worldview by stating, “Not every form of life is inherently precious, sacred and valuable. That includes human forms of life.” Indeed, she states, “To say otherwise is arguably a religious position. (It’s religious people who believe we possess souls from conception thanks to God.)”

And with that observation, we come full circle to our premise: If we fail to recognize God and His Word, we will inevitably stray from biblical morality. We will reject the idea that He created us male and female. We will reject the idea that men and women are uniquely fashioned for each other. We will reject the idea that human life is sacred, beginning in the womb. And we will certainly reject the idea that human beings are created in the image of God, with all that implies.

That’s why I have argued that the only type of conservatism that can bring lasting change to America is a biblically-based, God centered conservatism. All other efforts will fall short in the end.

It is true that there “is far too much diversity among both atheists and theists to assume that they stand on opposite sides of any particular issue.”

But it is also true that general patterns apply and that the worldview of an atheist will be very different than the worldview of a Bible-based theist. And that means any true moral transformation in America will start with a “back to God” movement. It is the absence of God that is our greatest problem today.