

No Truth? Then No Rationality! And No Enduring Society!

“...they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds became darkened” (Romans 1:21).

The concept of “truth” has two interrelated poles including firstly that the contents of any given assertion must factually harmonize with the circumstances it addresses. Yet under that definition truth secondly implies moral obligations to *obey* it, even as it urges us to repudiate falsehood.¹ Under these criteria, Leftism² is intellectually incoherent. To give a primary example, although President Biden insists others “*follow the science*” with respect to the Covid19 onslaught, he chronically ignores such facts as get in the way of his own covert, though driving agenda. Five illustrations include:

1. On Feb. 8 he announced withholding military intelligence from Donald Trump on the allegation of “[Trump’s] erratic behavior,” in part by Trump’s alleged inciting an insurrection on Jan. 6. The grounds for Biden’s charge can be assessed by studying Trump’s speech just prior that incident. Yet Biden’s chronic failure to highlight which evidence he alleges damns Trump, renders Biden a liar both for the reason that there is no such evidence, and that he persists in ignoring that reality.
2. The Democrat platform chronically decries the melting of glaciers as proof that the use of fossil fuels are the primary cause of climate change/global warming phenomena. Yet they ignore the provable fact that glaciers have been melting for 18,000 years.³
3. Leftism persists in championing abortion rights on the allegation that the fetus is only an aspect of the “mother’s body as opposed to being an independent human being. This denial fails to acknowledge the distinction of blood type, genetic code, body structure, and potentially sexual anatomy between the mother and the developing child.
4. The Tucker Carlson program today aired clips from every “ABC” TV networks parroting in nearly identical language Biden’s “commitment” to “*truth, science, and transparency.*”⁴

All of the above four points involve suppressing undesirable or inconvenient facts (Rom. 1:18), which commits the informal error, the *fallacy of exclusion*. Yet the situation is vastly worsening!

5. On Jan. 20, 2021 Joe Biden signed an *Executive Order (EO)* permitting biologically-male transgenders (**TGRs**) to both compete in females’ sports and shower in girls dressing rooms should they choose.⁴ These principles extend to demanding that TGRs be addressed with the pronoun or title of their choice by everyone else in *public* contexts. One news article affirming NCAA sympathies toward Biden’s EO, defended the same position in part by appealing to *polling* which affirmed its support by the *public*⁵ in contradiction to societal protections that are specified in our Constitution. Now I want to be clear that my paper is neither an attack on TGRs nor a denial that their *inner* feelings are real. It is instead an urgent demand that legislators create public policy that **avoids both** imposing double-standards onto society on the one hand, and vio-

¹ H.D.P. Lee, tr. Plato. *The Republic*. (Penguin, 1955), # 394, p. 133. ** Notice also Jesus in John 8:44-47 and St. Paul in 2 Cor. 4:2.

² Anyone left of center on the political/philosophical/sociological scale.

³ /16/2021, 8:05 pm. I dismantle that claim in my posting, “Leftism’s Claims to be Champions of Science is a Gigantic Fraud,” at my blog, www.offensivechristianity.blogspot.com, 11/10/2020.

⁴ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-preventing-and-combating-discrimination-on-basis-of-gender-identity-or-sexual-orientation/>

⁵ “Mythbusters: Debunking Anti-Transgender Messages” https://freedomforallamericans.org/mythbuster-debunking-antitransgender-messages/?gclid=EAlalQobChMIsretyfr7gIVAYeGCh2_0wqxEAAYBCAAEgJWK_D_BwE

lating freedom of consciences and *intellectual* (scientific) convictions in accordance with Article 1 of the Bill of Rights, on the other. Biden's EO at bottom violates not only the right to privacy principle (initially enacted to protect *consenting adults*); it also disregards defenseless children of their modesty even as it deprives parents of their authority to secure their children's safety.

Ironically, in order for Leftists to retain their vital distinction between the phenomena of genetics and anatomy (**GA**) on the one hand, and *subjective* "gender identity" (**GI**) on the other, they must contradict a core tenet of Darwinism they are eager to maintain.⁶ Materialism, as it is called, denies the reality of non-material entities (God, gods, spirit(s), soul, self, etc.) by holding that **only impersonal matter and energy exists**.⁷ So this view holds it to be conceptually impossible for soulish beings (humans) to have existence.⁸ Since science by definition addresses only material entities that are empirically¹⁰ perceptible, the notion of a *personal self* which could be detectable only by testimony from the agent in question, the existence of which materialism denies even in principle, the TGR claim becomes **intellectually incoherent**. It is indeed also a travesty that the scientific community fails to discredit as nonscientific the **elevation of gender-identity over and above** the decisive facticity of genetics and anatomy.

Yet the above intellectual errors are more consequential in scope than merely isolated ideological positions on questions of sexual dysfunction. The ramifications that follow from the above case extend to the very basis of rationality itself. The *First Principle of Rationality*, known as *The Law of Non-Contradiction*, holds that *contradictory propositions cannot both be true* in the same way and at the same time. So when it is legally insisted that an anatomical male be identified as a female, both in terms of the rights of the specific candidate in question, and also that the surrounding members of society become legally obligated to regard the same candidate as truly a female, then the *First Principle of Rationality* is severed from public rational discourse. This principle is not an optional aspect of rationality, but to the contrary is the very basis of rationality from which every other rational principle depends. The *First Principle* cited above is not merely helpful in utilitarian terms, it instead must be true in every possible context in order that rationality can be universally trusted to apply equally to every single person. This is why its perverted application was decried by the prophet in Isaiah 59:14. If truth is not elevated above ideology, then there are no grounds for relating to each other in trust. Trust demands common commitments to truth!

Gary Jensen, Pastor © February 16, 2021
Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA

⁶ To be clear, I do not consider the materialist view to be valid. You may access my paper, "Scientism is Not Science" at my website, Op.cit. (3). ** My contention in this paper is instead that Darwinists contradict their very own metaphysical tenets.

⁷ Francis Darwin, ed. The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin. Charles Darwin to W. Graham, (July 31, 1881), "... with me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of a man's mind, which has developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy." ** Peter Bowler. Evolution: The History of an Idea. (U. California, 2003) stated, "Darwin saw no room for the traditional notion of a soul existing on a purely spiritual plane: the mind was the product of the material activity of the brain." p. 163. ** Neo-Darwinist and paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould stated, "Darwin applied a consistent philosophy of materialism to his interpretation of nature," in which "mind, spirit, and God as well are words that express the wondrous results of neuronal complexity." Ever Since Darwin: Reflections on Natural History. Cited in Nancy Pearcey. Finding Truth. (David Cook, 2015), pp. 195-6.

⁸ Take note of Angus Menuge's book, Agents Under Fire: Materialism and the Rationality of Science. (Rowman & Littlefield, 2004). ¹⁰ Physical entities, as opposed to abstract ideas that can be perceived by one or more of our five senses.