

## The Sheer Irrationality of Leftist Demands

*"Since...they did not honor him as God...they became futile in their thinking and their foolish minds were darkened."* (Romans 1:21)

The argument this essay seeks to make against those who embrace leftist assumptions<sup>1</sup> does NOT pertain to the *fact* of their hostility toward conservative beliefs, but to the folly they exude in such rantings. Leftists have their own implicit body of tenets<sup>2</sup> which ought to bind them to the very same standards of discourse they impose onto those they oppose. For this reason I challenge the rationality of leftism on the grounds that they discard their core beliefs whenever convenient on their march to contradict traditional views. Therefore my central purpose in this paper is to highlight why it is that leftist argumentation isn't merely bereft of confirmatory evidence; it is chronically logically fallacious.

Leftists firstly commit a double-standard with respect to the concept of morality. On the one hand, by their denial of the existence of a transcendent personal moral law-giver (God), they thereby decree as illegitimate (and consequently, non-binding) the authority of moral codes for the reason that the legitimacy of the latter is dependent on the actual *existence* of God. Ironically however, leftists at the same time are resolute in their determination to impose imperatives of their own-creation onto society. The incongruity of this ploy is further amplified by their portraying their views as *morally* superior to those they oppose. This is expressed by means of publicly shaming the latter. In so doing they stand in utter contradiction to their expressed denial of *moral* authority. So unless they admit that their motives for these ploys are merely utilitarian, they effectively betray their own inner-confusion. After all if, as they say, it is really the case that morality has no validity, it then follows that their claim to standing on the *moral* high ground is not only intellectually incoherent, but fraudulent as well.

In order to legitimate their goal to overhaul societal *institutions*, leftism also frequently appeals to advancements in scientific insight, yet they do so only in a selective manner. One glaring example of their agenda to overthrow conservative views entails redefining the concept of sexual identity. As of the time of my writing the traditional classification of the sexes into male or female is now devolved into 63 separate genders according to recent polls.<sup>3</sup> Yet the methods employed that yield this number entails, of necessity, the utter denial of the those factors having features which, alone, can be scientifically observed and measured, namely genetic and anatomical factors. As for the first of these, it simply cannot be altered even if the individual's anatomy is surgically mutilated. Nevertheless today's intellectual climate that is marked by ideological relativism (IR) enables peoples' inner sexual perceptions to override not only how individuals *personally* experience their own sexual identities. IR also prescribes the legal obligations imposed onto society as a whole which include permitting self-identified TGs to shower in whichever public shower facility they "claim" to identify with. More astounding still is the legal requirement that all others address TGs by the gender pronoun that the latter embraces. It is highly significant that, with great effectiveness, the homosexual movement decades ago guarded its freedoms of expression under the banner of the "right to privacy" because it worked in their favor at that time. Yet leftists today belittle that principle when the privacies concern the wishes of parents to protect the modesty and safety of their own children. The absurdity of this double-standard is palpable.

Pastor Gary Jensen © August 8, 2019  
Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA

---

<sup>1</sup> Even though the term I prefer to use is "secularism," the word I employ here is "leftism" for the reason that the latter overtly expresses the logical extension of the assumptions that are implied by the former in its moderated form.

<sup>2</sup> Wayne Booth. *Modern Dogma and the Rhetoric of Assent*. (The University of Notre Dame, 1974).

<sup>3</sup> [www.refinery29.com/en-us/sexual-orientation-types-of-sexualities](http://www.refinery29.com/en-us/sexual-orientation-types-of-sexualities)