



If Government Can't Fix It, What Will?



By Kevin Kookogey, Guest Columnist

Following the deadly San Bernardino terrorist attack several weeks ago, some of our political leaders took to Twitter to express their condolences. Senator Ted Cruz tweeted that “*our prayers are with the victims, their families, and the first responders in San Bernardino.*” Speaker of the House, Paul Ryan, urged his fellow Americans to “*please keep the victims of San Bernardino in your prayers.*” Kentucky Senator Rand Paul expressed that his “*thoughts and prayers are with the victims, families, and brave first responders.*” And even Lindsey Graham acknowledged the necessity of prayer.

The next day, the New York Daily News commanded the attention of the nation with its provocative cover-story declaration that “GOD CAN'T FIX THIS!” Encircling the bold, all-caps headline were four (4) cartoonish boxes, each containing a photograph of and the prayer attributable to the political leaders who had expressed them. Below the headline, in slightly smaller yet every-bit-as-snarky font, appeared the following: “*As latest batch of innocent Americans are left lying in pools of blood, cowards who could truly end gun scourge continue to hide behind meaningless platitudes.*”

Before jumping ahead to defend the belief in God's omnipotence, since that appears to be the focus of the paper's attack, one must first ask the Daily News' Editors *why* they believe something needs fixing. It is safe

to assume that the Daily News' editors reject God, and rather proudly so.

Consistent with such a belief is that there exists no absolute or transcendent, universal moral standard. In their view, truth is relative, accorded only such authority as fashion or convenience may dictate from time to time.

Everyone has a worldview – a core set of beliefs – that serves as the foundation for his statements, his arguments, and his positions. All human beings acknowledge and operate under universal moral principles, whether or not they recognize them or admit it.

Many Leftists attempt to disguise their beliefs, hoping to convince us that they are starting from the proverbial “clean slate,” with no pre-conceived notions or beliefs informing their words and actions.

We must ask the Editors how it is that they conclude something is broken. What is the big “it” they so vigorously contend that “God cannot fix”?

With no absolute moral standard or universal definition of the way things are *supposed* to be, how does one measure something that is *not* what it is supposed to be? In other words, unless there is a straight line, how does one recognize a crooked line?

The quickest way to prove that Leftists operate in a Biblical worldview, despite their vigorous assertions to the contrary, is to steal something from them. Suddenly those who claim that truth is relative, or that morals are mere convention, begin making absolute moral claims against the behavior. They demonstrate a commitment to universals even while rejecting the very existence of them.

If your neighbor steals your tomatoes and you catch him, he will either deny it, justify it, or apologize for his behavior. Whatever his response, it will affirm the unspoken acceptance of a universal moral principle pressing upon him, telling him that stealing your tomatoes is wrong.

This is why we can say with confidence that the Left has no intellectual defense for what they believe while regularly proving Biblical Truth - or what our founders called "moral order".

If the Editors seek intellectual cover under the theory that what is right for a people or culture is determined by convention or some general consensus of a majority of people (or the "herd instinct") then on what basis did anyone have to object to human slavery? That diabolical institution was at one time -and remains in certain cultures today- an acceptable practice adopted by a consensus of people.

Does the Left, considering all of the statistically unpopular causes it seeks to advance, really want to hang its intellectual hopes on convention or consensus? If consensus were the true measuring stick, why does the Left constantly resort to the judicial branch to overturn the consensus of the people as expressed through their legislatures?

So what are we to conclude about all of this?

Aside from the political purpose of the Editors' attempt to undermine the 2nd Amendment, the blatant moral objective of the New York Daily News' pointed missive is that God's failure or refusal to intervene to prevent the San Bernardino terrorist attack is sufficient evidence that God does not exist or, if He does, He is certainly not all-powerful nor all-loving.

According to the Editors' line of thinking, only the State can save us. But the State has no answers. The State can only pick up the pieces after a tragedy. The State can only avenge bad conduct after it has occurred. The State can only pass laws to address *future* circumstances, and with each act of terror the hand of the State will fall upon us heavier and heavier as it desperately aims to eliminate that which it is powerless to change.

The State, indeed, can only work on the *outer* man, and even then only superficially and at the expense of human liberty and happiness. This does not mean that the State has no role, of course.

Only virtue can preserve society. Only virtue can proactively restrain

bad acts. Only virtue can impel one to sacrifice and surrender one's own interests for the interests of others.

The American founding documents are the political expression of the conviction that there can be no order in society without order in the soul. There can be no constitutional order without moral order, that is, an inner restraint on the permanent problems of the human condition – or what we Christians refer to as “original sin”.

If we aim to preserve a free and civil society, then, we must encourage virtue. And since one cannot account for virtue absent a belief in a transcendent, universal moral standard, pressing upon us to do what is right and making us uncomfortable when we don't, then it follows that our obedience to these universal truths will increase our freedom, our safety, and our happiness.

Our entire social civil order is a voluntary compact. The terms and conditions of the operating agreements – or any laws, for that matter – are only as good as the commitment of people to abide by them.

Kevin Kookogey spent more than two decades as an entertainment lawyer and music industry executive. In an age of creeping socialism and intellectual neglect, he took on the responsibility of home-schooling his six children. As President & Founder of Linchpins of Liberty, Kevin has risen to national prominence for his principled and articulate defense of ordered liberty. For more on this subject, or to listen to Kevin on these topics in his weekly radio address on 99.7 WTN with Michael DelGiorno, please visit advancingchurch.com

The Language of Liberty series is a collaborative effort of the Center for Self Governance (CSG) Administrative Team. The authors include administrative staff, selected students, and guest columnists. They may be contacted at info@tncsg.org To learn more, go to CenterForSelfGovernance.com.

Word Count: 1172