

OpenTheo

Atheists Want Dominion?!? Do you?

July 13, 2022



For The King - Rocky Ramsey

In this episode I discuss two Supreme Court cases. NEW YORK STATE RIFLE & PISTOL ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL. v. BRUEN, SUPERINTENDENT OF NEW YORK STATE POLICE, ET AL and Dobbs v. Jackson. I also discuss a federal grant to export atheism, humanism, and non-religious adherents worldwide, hence the pagans are Postmill. I hope you enjoy it friends! Sources: Dobbs v. Jackson Case New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen Epoch Times article on federal grant exporting atheism -> The letter written by GOP'ers challenging the grant -> The grant website ITSELF Article reporting on young women being encouraged to abort babies Fountain.fm ->

<https://fountain.fm/show/U78tm316mhRmq1LFZ6HS> Website: forthekeingpodcast.com

Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/For-The-King-105492691873696/> Gab page:

<https://gab.com/ForTheKingPod> Contact: forthekeingpodcast@gmail.com Donate Crypto:

<https://commerce.coinbase.com/checkout/f63fd7db-919e-44f6-9c58-8ec2891f3eb5>

Kingly Clothing: <https://www.bonfire.com/store/for-the-king/> --- Support this podcast:

<https://podcasters.spotify.com/pod/show/rocky-ramsey/support>

Transcript

If that was what this, if we were trying to hand out grants, the government was, the federal government was handing out grants to push Christianity so that people can include Christians more in their countries. You would hear an uproar. You would hear an uproar.

And the point I want to make as I am going through this and reading this and seeing what our government is doing, our pagan, idolatrous, satanic government led by Joe Biden, a baby, and Kamala Harris, a woman. The atheists, the secularists, the satanists, they're post-mill. Don't think I will even ask you to make Jesus Lord of your life.

That's the most preposterous thing I could ever tell you to do. Jesus Christ is Lord of your life. Whether you serve him or not, whether you bless him, curse him, hate him, or love him, he is the Lord of your life because God has given him a name that is above every name so that the name of Jesus Christ every knee shall bow and tongue confess that he

is Lord.

Some of you will bow out of the grace that has been given to you and others will bow because your kneecaps will be broken by the one who rules the nations with a rod of iron. And I'll not apologize for this God of the Bible. Well, hello, friends.

Welcome to the For the King podcast. I am your host, Rocky Ramsey. On this podcast, we declare the edicts of the king chiefly and namely that Yahweh, the great I am, reigns and his son is Jesus Christ.

So I appreciate you guys tuning in to the podcast today. Like I said, last episode, I will be doing most of these solo from now on. I'm hoping to kind of adjust the podcast a little bit.

And I gave a little explanation last episode on how I'm going to kind of switch up my upload dates, but I'm going to try to do at least one a week. Two Sundays a week for the Sunday series, more theological topics. And then episodes like today on the Wednesdays where I speak more on politics, social commentary, worldview issues, things like that.

This will also be where I conduct interviews when I have somebody onto the podcast. But today I'm just riding solo. So I'll be doing this Wednesday episode by myself.

The two things I wanted to talk about today would be the Roe v. Wade being overturned, finally officially being overturned. I released an episode about abortion being pre political a few weeks back when the leak happened. But now that the decision has actually been handed down on June 24th, I actually wanted to actually talk about it a little bit more in depth.

And then I actually want to uncover a very wild thing I found that the government has been doing concerning the exporting atheism overseas on government dollars. Okay, so those are the two things I want to talk about and highlight another Supreme Court case just briefly. So first, with the Roe v. Wade being overturned, the Roe v. Wade decision, overturned in the Dobbs versus Jackson decision on June 24th.

I read part of the document, not all of it. And I'm just going to give some brief thoughts, continued thoughts on this whole situation. I still maintain the position from the last episode where I touched on this issue that abortion is still pre political.

Abortion is still not something that needs to be deciphered in the courts. There is so much precedence as the decision noted. There's so much precedence in our legal history of abortion being illegal, criminalized all throughout America's history.

And basically any Christian country throughout all of human history has abolished abortion. It's been criminalized. So it's a deviancy that Roe v. Wade was a deviancy from the Christian worldview and was obviously, you know, the courts legislating.

The courts out of the penumbra, the shadows of the Constitution, trying to draw out from the 14th Amendment, this right to murder humans, murder babies, which is, again, a pre political issue, not something that needs to be deciphered by the courts. So just to build more on that, I want to read just the intro to the Constitution here. I have it in front of me.

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America. And then Constitution describes how our political system works, the three branches of government, and then the Bill of Rights view articles at the end of the Constitution, a new race of rights that we have by God, that the government is to secure for us through those three branches of government.

The 14th Amendment added later, after the Civil War, I forget exactly when, states this. Well, I'm sorry, before I move on, what I want to piggyback on from that intro that I just read to the Constitution, it says, "For ourselves, all those things listed, the common defense and liberty for ourselves, and also for our posterity." Now, what is our posterity? What is that? Well, that's our offspring. That is the people that will inherit the liberty, the freedoms that the Constitution enumerated, that it's not only just for those people in that generation of the founding fathers pinning the document, but it's also for their children.

And how are children made? Children are made in the wombs of mothers. What is abortion? Abortion is the taking of the life in the womb. If you took the conceived cells in the uterine wall after it's implanted in the woman's uterus, and you took those cells and you placed them on Mars, and let's say you put it in a small glass dome and you gave it the nutrients and the water that it needs to survive on Mars.

And let's say the Mars rover stumbles upon this glass dome with a fertilized egg inside of it. And let's say it lifts the dome up or somehow gains access to the egg and puts it in a closed system in a vial or something and brings it back to Earth. And all the scientists at NASA, they look at this, they're puzzled by it and they say, "Wow, we have found life on Mars.

This is a completely unique organism." You know, obviously it's human, they would realize that, but I hope you see my point. They would proclaim, you'd see on the news headlines the following day, you'd say, "Wow, we found life on Mars." And to try to cut off your posterity forcefully, either through chemical abortifacients or physically going into the womb like an abortionist would to destroy a baby, you have to be suppressing so much truth that you're verging on, you're an idiot. You can't think straight.

You can't connect dots in your head of the most basic things in life, similar to how the transgender movement, all that. It's the most obvious things that they cannot see. So if

we're going to pass on these liberties to our posterity, then I don't know, maybe the natural extension of that is you should bring the fertilized cells to full term because it's a human.

It's a human life in the womb. Maybe you should do that. Maybe that makes a lot of sense.

And now, the 14th amendment that they found somehow a right to murder a baby, let me read that real quick. "All persons born," I'm just reading section one, by the way, of the 14th amendment, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." So you can't deny any person.

The state is not allowed to deny any person life. And I realize it says all persons born, right? You don't have to be born to be a person, though. Some people are born a little sooner, right? You don't achieve personhood when you come out of the womb just because you're less developed than somebody else.

You don't achieve personhood based on that. But you achieve personhood ontologically by nature of being a unique human fertilized in the womb through mother and father coming together in sexual intercourse. That is how a person is made.

So if you take that person outside of the womb and hook it up, you can grow embryos in a test tube, right? It's not the location of it. It's not the matter of development. It's that it's its own living thing.

And every argument that you try to make falls apart. You can apply that argument, level of development, consciousness, whatever you want to try to describe the womb baby as, the fetus. You can apply to some person in a state outside of the womb, which would then justify killing somebody in a coma, somebody that's mentally challenged because they're less developed, whatever the case.

Even young children, right? You can always apply it to somewhere outside of the womb. So it's a foolish argument. And the 14th amendment clearly states that you're not allowed to deny people any person life, liberty or property.

The states are not allowed to do that. So the reason I read the 14th amendment here is because *Dobbs versus Jackson*, yes, it repudiated *Roe v. Wade*. Praise God.

That's a small, small skirmish. I wouldn't even call it a battle almost. It's a very small skirmish in a very long war against secularism, atheism and all the other religions of the world that want to legislate their own morality in America.

So the decision concluded with that it should be returned to the states. It's not up to the federal government to determine that babies, they couldn't just rule that babies are, fetuses are actually humans, made in the image of God and they have rights. No, we're going to let the states decide whether or not they're going to deprive a person of life, liberty or property.

Right? Do you see my logic there? The 14th amendment is clear. The states are not allowed to deny anybody those things. And what precisely happened in Dobbs versus Jackson is that the conservatives said we need to leave it up to the states to determine if you're allowed to murder babies or not and deny somebody their life.

So that is the inconsistency of conservatism of the Republicans in our land. The only people that are actually consistent in their worldview are either atheistic nihilists or Christians or the jihadist Muslims. Those are the consistency.

We have to maintain consistency with our position that abortion is murder and that murder is not up to the states to decide. So that's my point with the 14th amendment and just more rhetoric out of me and what I think about what's happened. I think that there are so many fake conservatives out there and I don't think we need to view this at all as a win.

This is a very small skirmish that we came out on top in terms of conservative biblical values and it still wasn't even, it didn't go far enough. And Dobbs versus Jackson, God still views that ruling as an abomination. God is not pleased with Dobbs v. Jackson.

Although I understand incrementally that's a step in the right direction. But I'm an abolitionist so I mean I understand incrementally that's where we want to go but it's still an abomination in the eyes of God. And the last thing I want to talk about with the whole Dobbs versus Jackson decision and just this whole rhetoric when we're fighting the left, we're fighting atheists on this issue, feminists, all these people.

We have to, we don't let them get away with saying the women's rights just got trampled upon. The Supreme Court just took away a woman's right to abortion. We need to get our idea of rights correct.

Rights are not positively given by the state. That's positive law or positive rights. That the state, that is the whole point of what I just read in the Constitution that these amendments, specifically the Bill of Rights, are enumerating the rights that we have by God.

They're not given by the state and that's what the Federalists were really concerned about. The Republicans wanted to add the Bill of Rights and the Federalists were worried that people would interpret that as the federal government giving the people of the United States those rights. Rather than it just being assumed that you have these rights

from God.

The Federalists wanted the American people to just have that assumed in the way they went about their politic. But here we are. This is what we ended up with in our country and it's not the worst thing in the world.

And we need to maintain as Christians that rights come from God in the same way that our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, our founding fathers, they were Christians. And they legislated and created a government based on Christian values. Not on atheistic secular values, not on Muslim Jihadism.

None of that. No other worldview besides Christianity. So here are the points I want to make here.

Rights come from God. Rights are not given by the state, rather recognized by the state. Whenever we hear chatter about women's rights, or any right for that matter, coming from a non-Christian, we need to push the antithesis hard to show them their folly.

And what I mean by pushing the antithesis is, show them the folly. Answer the fool according to his folly. Oh wow, so we have a right to murder a child.

Let's extend that logic, right, like I was talking about earlier, to someone in a coma. Let's extend your logic. Let's determine, so you think you have a right to murder a child, what if I wanted to get rid of... There were plenty of people in Nazi Germany that wanted to get rid of certain people that were definitely outside of the womb.

They didn't think they had a right to live. So they wanted to exterminate Jews, right? That is, in any other worldview that's subjected by nature, which would be Nazi Germany, atheism, or Nazism, fascism, communism, your rights are given by the state, given by human reasoning, human subjective reasoning. So whenever we hear that chatter of women's rights, we want to say, "Well, according to you, that's a woman's right." That's not given by God.

That's something that we have deciphered, something we've imposed on women, that they have a right to do this, so they ought to. And if you have a right to do something, then you ought to do it. So we have to understand that positive rights only go as far as they ensure negative rights.

So, for example, I have a right to...well, okay, I have a right to not be murdered, okay? Nobody's allowed to kill me unless I forfeit that by committing a crime that's worthy of capital punishment. Or I go to war and get killed in war, something like that. But just living as a law-abiding citizen in society, I have a right to not be murdered.

But it's also positively, everybody else has the positive right to ensure that my right is met. So, for instance, everybody has to not kill me. They have to not come at me with a

knife and make me defend myself.

So not only do I have a right to not be murdered, everybody else has to ensure that I have that right maintained in civil society by not killing me. So if they really want to claim that a woman has a right to an abortion, then that puts an obligation on every other human in the American society to make sure that women that want abortions are provided with the means to that right. So this is the same...in the same way if we say we have a right to clean water.

Well, then somebody has to install a system and extract the water and clean the water so that my right is met. I hope you see that. Positive rights only go so far as to ensure the negative right that counteracts it, in a sense.

And not every right's like that. I'm just using a woman's right to an abortion is that kind of positive right that everybody else would be forced to ensure that she has her right met. So there's my points on that, on the Robey Wade decision.

They're starting on the Dobbs v. Jackson decision over turning Robey Wade. So if you're a conservative Christian, you know, the Dobbs v. Jackson decision is not your friend. That's not the kind of ruling a Christian society would want to see.

The next thing I wanted to briefly know before we get into the real juicy stuff is the New York State Rifle and Pistol Association versus Bruin Superintendent of New York State Police. This was a Supreme Court ruling that happened, I think, right after. There's a very recent one.

You can go look at it online. I'm going to provide some links to these cases like the Dobbs v. Jackson case and the one I just said, New York Rifle Association versus Bruin. So the U.S. Supreme Court has not ruled on a major gun case since handing down its landmark decision, District of Columbia v. Heller, more than a decade ago.

So that's regarded as one of the most important Supreme Court gun cases, and the majority decision determined that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to have a gun in the home for the purpose of self-defense. So this law said the state of New York was trying to make it a crime to possess a firearm without a license, whether inside or outside the home. And by the way, I am quoting from the Supreme Court ruling that was quoting the actual law itself.

So the state of New York makes it a crime to possess a firearm without a license, whether inside or outside the home. An individual who wants to carry a firearm outside his home may obtain an unrestricted license to quote, this is from the law, have and carry a concealed pistol or revolver. If he can prove that, quote, proper cause exists for doing so.

So an applicant satisfies the, quote, proper cause in that New York law requirement only

if he can demonstrate – this is also in the law – demonstrate a special need for self-protection, distinguishable from that of the general community. So basically saying that you have to be able to show that you have a really, really special reason to be carrying outside of your home if you're allowed to possess a license to carry a firearm in the general public. So here's what the court ruled.

This is – now I'm quoting from – this is a quote from the ruling in the decision. "The constitutional right to bear arms in public for self-defense is not a second-class right subject to an entirely different body of rules than the other Bill of Rights guarantees. We know of no other constitutional right that an individual may exercise only after demonstrating to government office for the defense of his person, property or family.

Opinion of the court errs some special need. That is not how the first – I might be reading that wrong. I'm sorry.

I'm continuing though. I'm sorry. That is not how the First Amendment works.

When it comes to unpopular speech or the free exercise of religion, it is not how the Sixth Amendment works when it comes to a defendant's right to confront the witness against him. And it is not how the Second Amendment works when it comes to public carry for self-defense. New York's proper cause requirement violates the 14th Amendment in that it prevents law-abiding citizens with ordinary self-defense needs from exercising their right to keep and bear arms.

We therefore reverse the judgment of the court of appeals and remand the case for further proceedings consistent with this opinion." Okay. So their argument basically consists in – just like the other amendments, you don't have to find a special, a distinguishable reason for bearing an arm out in public. In the same way, you don't need a special reason to exercise your free religion or your free speech out in public.

You don't have to distinguish yourself and able to exercise that right. So interesting reasoning. Here's what I want to know.

If this case would have upheld the government, the government would have defined proper cause as anything they would have liked. Proper cause could be you're a police officer and that's it. Or I don't even know what they would come up with but somehow you're a security guard for a mall.

I don't know. Something like that. So they could have defined it as anything they want and denied the citizens of New York the right to bear arms in public, concealed carry.

This case could have began precedents for other states to deny people the right to bear arms. But here's my question. What do we think about the reasoning of the court opinion? Should the Second Amendment be unqualified as freedom of religion/speech is unqualified? So obviously these other rights, they're not forever rights.

They're not infinite in your exercise of them. You can't say anything you want. You can't...well what I argue is you're not allowed to exercise any religion you want.

There's no right from God to worship a pagan. God. There's no right from God to worship any other religion.

There's no right that God gives you to worship that which isn't him. God doesn't give you a right to create idols. You do that in sin and God judges you accordingly.

So again, I think this is really bad reasoning from the conservative courts. And in the same sense, you're not allowed to own a weapon if you're a convicted felon. If you're a law-abiding citizen though, you can wield a gun.

There are qualifications to every one of these rights. You're not allowed to yell fire in a movie theater or whatever. I don't think that you should...there's no right in the Constitution to worship Allah or any other religion or atheism.

You're not allowed to be an atheist based on what the Constitution says. Religion to the founding fathers wasn't any religion. Pure and undefiled religion is to visit orphans and widows and to love the stricken of society as it says in James.

Religion is Christian. So I think what is actually going on in the freedom of religion is that you're allowed to worship any denomination, any orthodox Christian denomination. The freedom of religion to the founding fathers was more like denominationalism, not freedom for other religions like Hinduism or Buddhism or any other religion.

So that is what I think the founding fathers were saying and you can read that in their writings. That is what they meant. They weren't thinking about protecting people that had a completely different worldview than the one that produced the Constitution.

If Muslims come to power in America, what's going to happen? They're going to implement jihad. They're going to upend a lot of the rights that are in the Constitution and they're going to enforce their legislation. Same thing with atheist humanism.

Everybody is going to enforce their legislation. So it's just the nature of reality. There's the myth of neutrality.

Okay, last thing I want to talk about as we wrap up here. This just blew my mind. This absolutely blew my mind.

And I'm going to give you a source so you can look at it for yourself because it is insane. It's absolutely insane and I want to make a big point here that I want you guys to hear and heed what I'm saying and understand where I'm coming from. So I get a lot of my news from the Epoch Times or Epoch Times.

I don't know whatever it is. And I got this little notification on my phone. It said, "House

GOPers demanding answers on why grants going to boost atheism overseas." Here's what the part of the news article states in the Epoch Times.

House Republicans study committee, RSC chairman, Representative Jim Banks, a Republican from Indiana, so hey let's go Indiana. And 15 other GOP colleagues are challenging the legality of State Department grants of as much as \$500,000 each to international organizations committed to the practice and spread of atheism and humanism. Now I went and looked at the PDF of the State Department that is handing out these grants.

Here is verbatim what this department is defining this grant as, what it's intended to do. So here's the expected program outcomes include, sorry the expected program outcomes include but are not limited to, increased availability of mechanisms for members or of minorities and marginalized groups, particularly atheists and non-believers, to advocate with community leaders and local and regional government officials regarding their religious freedom concerns. Increased capacity among members of atheists and heterodox individuals to form or join networks or organizations, implement advocacy campaigns and to engage with the public on issues of tolerance and acceptance of all regardless of faith.

Increased awareness and understanding among relevant government officials and law enforcement of the value and importance of human rights. Here's rights again guys remember when I was talking about that? We have to fight these guys on rights. Fight the atheist on rights.

They have no basis for rights at all. Human rights, peace, mutual respect, tolerance and inclusion for all irrespective of one's religion or beliefs. Increased awareness among citizens at the community level of concepts and implications of religious pluralism.

Mutual respect and inclusion for all regardless of religion or belief. Increased community level interfaith or advocacy interactions inclusive of atheist, humanist, non-practicing and non-affiliated individuals particularly those who are pressured, mandated and or coerced into religious participation that is contrary to their personal non-belief system or philosophy. Guys and I can go on and on and on.

Here's another one. Expecting or creating opportunities for dialogue, coalition building and joint action between faith and non-faith organizations in support of freedom of religion and belief. This can include but is not limited to public for a town halls, journalism, public outreach, education, media programs, small grants and other work.

And there's more to this. I'm not going to labor to sit here and read all this to you guys. But here's my question.

Let's insert every time it says particularly atheist and non-believers or particularly the

religious pluralism and mutual respect. Let's all that language, let's insert Christianity into that. Let's insert Christianity.

How pissed. You would hear an uproar from all the atheists. You can't push Christianity on me.

You can't force me to live like a Christian. I want to live like a pig and I want to rip babies out of the world baby. Right? That's what they want to do and they want a right to do it.

They want to have their rights met. If I put if say I was the head of this committee and I put Christianity in all this and I'm trying to export Christianity. Yeah.

Let's just here's this one. Let me insert Christianity and you'll see what I mean. Here's another bullet point.

Creating or strengthening networks of advocates for the diverse communities of atheist, humanist, non-practicing and non-affiliated individuals of all religious communities in target countries. Let me let me insert Christianity. Creating or strengthening networks of advocates for the diverse communities of Christians and Catholics and Orthodox Christians and non-affiliated individuals of all.

Do you see what I mean? If that was what this if we were trying to hand out grants, the government was the federal government was handing out grants to push Christianity so that people can include Christians more in their countries. You would hear an uproar. And the point I want to make as I am going through this and reading this and seeing what our government is doing are a pagan idolatrous satanic government led by Joe Biden, a baby and Kamala Harris, a woman.

As they are exporting this stuff, my point I want to make to all of you guys that don't share the same eschatology as me. The atheists, the secularists, the Satanists, they're post-mill. And what I mean by post-mill, if you're newer to this discussion, this is really, really important in our understanding of God's word.

Isaiah 9, there will be a child born and of the increase of his government, there will be no end. There are other forms of eschatology in the Christian faith that say that Satan still is able to deceive the nations per Revelation 20. He's not chained.

He's still loose and he is the God of this world and there's nothing we can do about it. The Christians will be trampled upon. We will be persecuted.

Nobody will turn to Christ. We won't be able to disciple the nations like Jesus told us to. We won't really be able to do it.

And then Jesus will come back and do it for us even though he told us to do it. And even the amillennialism of our present day does not stress the triumphant proclamation of the

gospel over the face of this earth. Habakkuk 2.14, for the knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

So the knowledge of who God is, of Yahweh, of Jesus Christ, will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. That is the promise and that has not happened yet. And Jesus explicitly tells the Christians to go and do that.

His disciples in Matthew 28, he says, "Go and disciple all the nations." And there is an eschatology in Christianity that says we will not be able to do that as God's church. Jesus told us to do something we cannot do. He gave us false hope.

The postmill is the only one that takes seriously the Great Commission and understands in Isaiah 9, Isaiah 2, all these texts that say that Jesus will reign. Even Daniel 7, he'll be given a kingdom. The whole world, even I think Revelation 11 says the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdom of Jesus.

We take that very seriously, those Christians that are postmillennial. Now, I don't want to completely marginalize my brothers in Christ that are pre-mill and ah-mill, but there's not a strong emphasis there for the Great Commission being successful. And the point I want to make is these people are exporting the faith, their faith of atheism and Satanism, to the ends of the earth.

They want atheism to cover the earth as the water covers the sea. The knowledge of nothingness, the knowledge of big bang and meaninglessness and nihilism. And fish turning into humans, pond scum turning into a crying human over a dead grandma, right? Pond scum became that.

So that's what they want to export. They're postmill. They think they can actually make a change in the world.

But the problem is, with their view, is that Satan's on a chain. They don't have any power. The kingdom, first Corinthians 4.20, the kingdom of God is not a matter of talk, but of power.

The atheists just go around talking. They got no power. There's no power in their words because they're speaking lies.

There's no power in lies. You only have power for a second, but eventually society implodes on itself because lies cannot sustain a society. Go read Plato's Republic.

Makes a great case for that. But the truth, the truth is powerful. And the kingdom of God is full of truth.

Because we know the one who is truth incarnate. Jesus Christ is truth. So that's my point.

I want to challenge you with that. If you have an eschatology of pessimism, you ought to

forsake that. Read God's word and see that when Jesus says, "Go and disciple and baptize all the nations, teaching them to obey all that I've commanded you." When Jesus says that, he's not saying, "I'm going to come back and set up a 1,000 year millennial reign, and that's when we'll actually do that.

You've got to wait for me to come back and then we'll really do it." No, he was saying, "We will do that as his people. We are more than conquerors." So that's my point with this. I want to wrap up here with just attacking conservatives more because they're just so fake.

It's ridiculous. They're almost more annoying than the Libby's. So even Jim Banks here from Indiana, like, "This guy sucks.

This guy can't--" He's not arguing as a Christian. And let me share with you why. In that article from the Epoch Times, in response to this grant to boost atheism overseas, Jim Banks led with 15 other GOP colleagues this letter that was written to the federal government on why they're doing this.

So let me read part of it to you. "To be clear, atheism and humanism are official belief systems." So in the United States, you can go read--there are so many court rulings that atheism is a religion and it's protected as a religion in our country. So any atheist that tries to tell you, "No, no, no, no, it's not--" "No, no, no, you're a stupid little Christian.

You don't understand anything." Atheism isn't a religion, dude. It's just a lack of belief. But don't go on--please don't look up online what disbelief means, okay? Please don't look that up because the definition of disbelief is lack of belief.

So my argument gets refuted on the spot if you look up that word. So just let me keep saying what I'm saying, but don't actually ever look up anything and learn anything. Just listen to me and shut up and stop following Jesus and believe in nothing.

And by the way, you're just a monkey. Isn't that awesome? Why don't you go throw some poop? So atheism and humanism are official belief systems. That's what they're claiming in this letter.

Let me continue here. "As an initial matter, therefore, we would like to know what other United States government programs supported with appropriate funds are being used either to encourage, inculcate, or to disparage any official belief system-- atheist, humanist, Christian, Muslim, or otherwise. It is one thing for the department to be tolerant and respectful of a wide range of belief systems and to encourage governments to respect the religious freedom interest of their citizens.

It is quite another for the United States government to work actively to empower atheists, humanists, non-practicing, and non-affiliated in public decision making. Any such program for any religiously identifiable group in the United States would be

unconstitutional. In addition to its constitutionality--constitutionally--dubious legal foundation, we also question how such a grant or cooperative agreement program advances the foreign policy interest in the United States.

Were such programs known by the citizens of the target countries, we would expect that local populations, interest groups, and governments would bristle at what any objective overseer would see as covert funding from a foreign power designated to shatter local, religious, and cultural relationships." So if the government were to start funding these kind of atheist groups, organizations in the Middle East, the Muslims would be up in a row because they would see that as a covert undermining of their entire society. And guess what? I as a Christian living in the United States, that is a Christian nation founded on Christian principles with the constitution enumerating rights and inalienable rights from our creator, that is Yahweh, right? I'm being undermined, okay? So I'm pissed as well. This is evil and wrong.

This is wicked. They are exporting the new religion, the new religion assumed under the federal government is that of atheism and that of secularism. Let me continue.

So they're making a good point here, but I'm going to bring up something here, a presupposition in a second that is going to be uniquely Christian and where I'm going to--we're going to deviate as Christians from these conservative chairmen that are writing these letters. One more paragraph. "Americans rightly discern this as a part of the broader effort on the part of your administration" the Biden administration "to promote radical progressive orthodoxy abroad.

Atheism is an integral part of the belief system of Marxism and communism. A few weeks ago, the United States Embassy in Germany erected a Black Lives Matter flag. Americans should be very alarmed at this.

It's not only that Black Lives Matter remains a highly divisive and increasingly unpopular movement here in the United States. The display is also denoting a promotion of a specific radical organization. Other recent initiatives of the State Department include creating a special representative for racial equity and justice whose mission will be to spread critical race theory and other progressive dogmas worldwide and working to remove restrictions on abortion around the globe.

We export so much abortion to places like Ukraine, places like Ireland. So here's my question after you hear me read through that. Is there anything wrong with their reasoning? Is religious liberty, every religion, getting an equal chance? How could we argue better than our pagan conservative representatives? These guys are saying what would be preferred by the government is that atheist, humanist, Christian, Muslim or otherwise to remain basically agnostic, to be secular, to just be hands off.

But whenever you go to legislate a law, then just make sure you legislate atheistic

humanism. Don't legislate any Christian morals. But let's be hands off in the government, right? These conservatives are cutting off the branch that they are standing on.

They say that the American government shouldn't take a stance. For instance, they'd make the same argument for them. So they're complaining about the German embassy having a Black Lives Matter flag.

Would they be, would these conservatives be mad if they flew a flag with a cross on it representing Christianity, mere Christianity? Would they let that fly? The conservatives? Because if they do let that fly, then their whole argument and reasoning here is completely invalid. And they are cutting off the branch that they're standing on. So they started off while saying, "Atheism and humanism is an official belief system and it ought not to be pushed because it's a belief system." But then they go on to try to step on a place of neutrality and they say that we shouldn't be promoting any organization.

The federal government should promote any special interest of any group. And that is wrong because every time you legislate, every time you open your mouth, any human, every time you open your mouth, you are advocating for a position about the world. You are articulating your worldview every time you open your mouth and wag your tongue.

You are articulating your worldview and what you think about the world. And you have a position. It's a myth of neutrality.

You cannot be neutral. Atheism is not neutral. It's not neutral at all.

It is opposed to every other religion in the world and there's no harmony. There's no harmony between Islam and Christianity. There's no harmony between Judaism and Christianity.

There's no harmony between truth and non-truth. The lies and truth cannot coexist. You can't have two competing truth claims and have them coexist.

So our conservative leaders ought to actually act like Christians and argue like Christians that are arguing like pagans. Although I do agree that this grant money, this \$500,000 is atrocious, I would have just argued differently. So, hey, I'll put my links in the show notes and I'll also put, I'm just going to note this in passing, but I'll also put a article of the White House encouraging girls 15 or younger to abort without their parents' consent.

And, you know, Biden's even played around with the idea of declaring a national health emergency because women don't have their health being taken care of by murdering babies inside of them. And, you know, the government's trying to provide ways for women to, you know, on federal and perform abortions and things like that. So I'll put that, the young girls being encouraged by the White House to abort without parents' consent.

I'll put that in there too. But I'll also put the links to everything else in this show. If there's anything you disagreed with, I know I was getting a little wild there.

I mean, I know if you're an atheist listening, right, you're just from the get-go, right? We're not on the same team, bud. But if you're a Christian and you disagree with maybe what I'm saying about, "Hey, the atheists are being, they're a postmill, so why aren't Christians, when Christians have a pessimistic eschatology, then they just roll over so their belly can get rubbed by the atheist?" When actually we should be more like lions out there fighting for the truth, making, shaming the wise of this world with our fullest Christian thoughts, you know, like Paul did. So that is, I think, what I, yeah, that's what I wanted to share with you today.

Whoever's listening to my voice. I appreciate all you guys that listen. I hope that it's edifying and I'm gonna try to find some more people to have on his interviews and as we chug forward on the podcast.

But yeah, we've changed up the format a little bit, so I won't be uploading as much, but hopefully that's actually better for you guys to have a chance to listen. There's not so much content being thrown at you guys. Maybe, hopefully it's a little more digestible.

Yeah, I'm finished enough to book Moby Dick right now, so look up for a episode being released soon about doing just an analysis of the book Moby Dick with my friend Noah. So that'll be a fun conversation. Look forward to that.

And yeah, I appreciate all you guys that listen. Check out my website, fortheKingpodcast.com, and again, if you disagree with anything I said, reach out to me at fortheKingpodcast@gmail.com. If you want to be a guest or come on to the podcast to talk to me, I'd love to do that. Yeah, I think that's pretty much it folks.

So thanks for listening, and I will end with the doxology to the king of the ages. Immortal, invisible, the only God, be honored in glory forever and ever. Amen.

Sole deo, glory.

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

[Music]

(music)

[MUSIC]