

## **Barack Obama’s Moral Worldview and the Future of American Liberty**

By Charles Thomas Dennis, Ph.D.

*March 21, 2016*

**T**he nature of government involvement in social leadership and development requires a continual inspection and critique by those governed. This is a vital requirement and responsibility necessary for the continuance of a free Constitutional Republic. As the primary obligation of government is the creation and maintenance of law, the greatest concern of the governed should never be less than the moral foundation upon which laws derive their meaning. Whenever this fountion moves from moral to immoral, liberty is replaced by tyranny. Because of President Obama’s professed Christianity and extremely influential position as Chief Executive, an objective, factual critique of his moral worldview is in order. It is in this regard alone that the following appraisal is necessary. It has nothing to do with disrespect in any form. It has everything to do with presenting the truth.

Two pertinent quotes from John Adams set the framework for this review. (1) “It is religion [Christianity] and morality alone, which can establish the principles upon which freedom can scurely stand.”<sup>1</sup> (2) “We have no government armed with power capable of contending with hman passions unbridled by morality and religion . . . Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.”<sup>2</sup> It cannot be more obvious; Biblical morality and American liberty are indissoluble.

President Obama presents his moral worldview explicitly. It is the framework and philosophy for all of his decisions. Everyone conducts themselves in life based on their moral worldview. In *The Audacity of Hope*, Mr. Obama writes concerning his “faith” that he is, “absolutely sure about—the Golden Rule.”<sup>3</sup> And in an interview with a reporter from the *Cathedral Age* magazine, concerning his “Christian faith” he states: “My main responsibility is to love God with all of my heart, soul, and mind, and to love my neighbor as myself.”<sup>4</sup> Mr. Obama’s desire to live by these teachings of Jesus is an admirable desire and one all citizens should imitate. However, unless one understands the accurate meaning of Matthew 7:12 and Matthew 22:36-40, one’s actions can be just the opposite of what are required.

Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount said: “Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.” (Matthew 7:12) The “law” spoken of here is what the Founders and Framers understood as the “Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God.” That is the moral law engrafted in man at creation and—because of “the fall”—the moral law given to Moses by God and inscribed in Scripture. Jesus referred to this law

again in an encounter with a Pharisee recorded in Matthew 22:36-40:

Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

This means, in loving your neighbor as yourself you will never treat them in such a way that violates God's moral law. Also, you will never encourage them to violate God's moral law. To do so would, in effect, be a contradiction of the very principle of love that Jesus requires. In President Obama's remarks at the National Prayer Breakfast on February 12, 2012, he said: "I believe in God's command to 'love thy neighbor as thyself.'" However, it is easy to misconstrue sentimentality for love; the outcome of each can be vastly different. Loving "the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind" does not accommodate any violation of His moral mandate. Jesus said in Matthew 5:17-18:

Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

At the close of the Sermon on the Mount Jesus delivered a foreboding warning concerning the seriousness of violating God's moral law. Understanding this is imperative with regard to the correct importance Mr. Obama gives to this sermon. Jesus proclaimed:

Not every one that says unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that does the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in your name? and in your name have cast out demons? and in your name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, you that work iniquity [*contempt and violation of law, iniquity, wickedness* <sup>5</sup>]. (Matthew 7:21-23)

In the "Golden Rule" and the Sermon on the Mount Jesus makes it clear that in order to fulfill love's requirements Biblical moral law can never be compromised. To compromise would be rebellion against God's will. The consequence of such folly to individuals and nations is incalculable. Now, the question that must be asked is, "Does President Obama's moral worldview comport with Jesus' teachings and American liberty as outlined by the great men who founded and framed our government and the rule of law?"

In *Audacity*, Mr. Obama correctly states: "Our law is by definition a codification of morality, much of it grounded in the Judeo-Christian tradition."<sup>6</sup> Except, he does not give credence to the fact that by this "tradition" is meant explicitly, Biblical moral law. The President presents an illogical and thus unacceptable requirement that to argue for morality from God's perspective, i.e. Biblical morality, one's argument must be framed in such a way that it does not violate principles: "accessible to people of all faiths, including those with no faith at all [which is to say atheists]."<sup>7</sup> This is because he confuses a "deliberative, pluralistic, democracy"<sup>8</sup> with a polytheistic democracy.

All arguments must be “universal, rather than religion-specific.”<sup>9</sup> This in effect removes God and His moral law from the discussion.

President Obama’s personal opinion and requirement does not have currency with the Founders and Framers. His belief removes the only objective moral view and replaces it with a subjective, arbitrary, “universal” concept that must be agreed upon by every mindset no matter how absurd. This certainly does not comport with a Christian nation, which leads to another point.

The President has stated on a number of occasions: “Whatever we once were, we are no longer just a Christian nation; we are also a Jewish nation, a Muslim nation, a Buddhist nation, a Hindu nation, and a nation of unbelievers [atheists].”<sup>10</sup> His marginalizing of Christianity by making it only one among many is a contradiction of the foundation of America’s social structure. His assessment of America is based on wishful thinking not on fact. Mr. Obama’s notion is: “In a pluralistic democracy, we have no choice.”<sup>11</sup> History proves the opposite.

In 2004 in an interview with Cathleen Falsani (then Religion Editor at the Chicago Sun-Times), Mr. Obama stated: “I believe that there are many paths to the same place, and that is a belief that there is a higher power, a belief that we are connected as a people.”<sup>12</sup> Unless Mr. Obama has changed his belief, he views Christianity as just another religion, just one way and not the only way to God. Jesus is more than what Mr. Obama stated when he answered the question, “Who is Jesus to you?” He said:

Jesus is a historical figure for me, and he’s also a bridge between God and man, in the Christian faith, and one that I think is powerful precisely because he serves as that means of us reaching something higher. And he’s also a wonderful teacher.<sup>13</sup>

If Jesus was just a “historical figure, “a bridge” and “a wonderful teacher,” then Christianity is a meaningless religion. If the death of Christ on Calvary’s Cross was just another way then Christ’s death would have been unnecessary and God could be maligned as depraved, Jesus a liar and the Bible fiction. But Jesus was not just, “a bridge between God and man, in the Christian faith.” Jesus declared: “I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man comes unto the Father, but by me.” (John 14:6) The importance here is it reveals Mr. Obama’s untenable, rationalistic view of Biblical truth. At best it is immature and worse it is heresy.

Mr. Obama confirmed this, saying: “When I read the Bible, I do so with the belief that it is not a static text but the Living Word and that I must be continually open to new revelations—whether they come from a lesbian friend or a doctor opposed to abortion.”<sup>14</sup> He has a right to his opinion. However, these statements reveal the basis for Mr. Obama’s arbitrary stance on moral issues that are diametrically opposed to those of orthodox Christianity and the true meaning of Scripture. This is confirmed by his definition of his “moral compass.” He states:

Those are the conversations I’m having internally. I’m measuring my actions against that inner voice that for me at least is audible, is active, it tells me where I think I’m on tract and where I think I’m off tract.<sup>15</sup>

*In other words he is his own best counsel when it comes to moral questions.* Mr. Obama filters Scripture through personal reasoning (in the vein of the “Enlightenment spirit,” which he falsely attributes to the Founders<sup>16</sup>) in order to accommodate a reconstruction of morality. He pits his rationalization against God’s revelation and sometimes he sides with God and sometimes he does not. The issue is that Mr. Obama judges God as to whether God is right or wrong.

In this regard, Mr. Obama does not equivocate in the least when he writes concerning the justification for his position on homosexual marriage: “Nor am I willing to accept a reading of the Bible that considers an obscure line in Romans to be more defining of Christianity than the Sermon on the Mount.”<sup>17</sup> Here he puts the Bible in conflict through the suggestion that it is inconsistent and contradictory, thus making it irrelevant. Romans, Chapter 1 does not contain anything approximate to “an obscure line.” Due to his personal construction of theological thought, he finds it “troubling” that “many practicing Christians” are unable “to compromise” concerning “gay marriage.”<sup>18</sup> He reaches this conclusion by importing into the discussion the failed philosophical position of moral equivalence.

Mr. Obama is at complete odds with Jesus. Jesus removed any foundation for Mr. Obama’s compromising view of moral law. To compromise God’s moral law shows “contempt” for it and leads to committing “wickedness.” Arbitrary morality embraces immorality and contradicts the Founders and Framers and their position on “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God.” Mr. Obama speaking of the Founders in relation to the establishment of our government contends: “Implicit in its structure, in the very idea of ordered liberty, was a rejection of absolute truth . . .”<sup>19</sup> This is *absolutely* untrue. His position undermines the fundamental truths undergirding our founding documents, form of government and rule of law.

To compound the issue, Mr. Obama believes the United States Constitution, like the Bible, should be interpreted in a similar manner. He says: “The Constitution is not a static but rather a living document, and must be read in the context of an ever-changing world.”<sup>20</sup> In other words, according to him, understanding the Constitution must be based on a subjective, revisionist reconstruction of its meaning. Which means it can mean almost anything one wants it to mean, at any given time to suite ones desires, whether good or evil.

The Bible gives a serious warning to those individuals who deliberately make their own desired choices confusing the issue of good and evil. It is just as relevant to nations as it is to individuals. The prophet warns, “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; . . .” (Isaiah 5:20) and the proverb declares, “He that justifies the wicked and he that condemns the just, even they both are abomination to the LORD.” (Proverbs 17:15)

Mr. Obama is on the wrong side of Christian orthodoxy, American history and American liberty. History records that the embracement of immorality is the keystone of a nation’s downfall. A nation under God is placed in a perilous position when she codifies by law that which challenges the moral directive of the One who grants her liberty. At the National Prayer Breakfast President Obama stated: “Today, with as many challenges as we face, these are the values I believe we’re going to have to return to in hopes that God will buttress our efforts.” There is a contradiction between Mr. Obama’s moral worldview (rejecting God’s moral mandate) and his appeal to God to

“buttress our efforts.” It is asking for God to bless America while at the same time Mr. Obama is codifying by fiat immoral practices that guarantee God’s judgment.

Mr. Obama is the chief representative of the Democratic Party and at the 2012 National Convention held at Charlotte, NC, the true nature of this party was revealed. When the removal of reference to God from the party platform created a political problem there was a directive from the President to restore the reference. To do so the delegates had to vote on the measure with a three-quarter majority necessary for approval. When the voice vote to restore the mention of God into the platform was taken the measure was overwhelmingly defeated. It was obvious the moderator was befuddled. Two more times the measure was put to a vote and two more times it was again overwhelmingly defeated.

The defeat of the motion was unacceptable. The President’s directive could not be allowed to be defeated. (The fact that the President did not deal with this issue before it became a political problem is telling.) The solution: declare that the motion passed even though every one who observed the proceedings recognized the deceit. The immediate outcry from the delegates was a grand reflection of the nature of the Democratic Party. Boos and hissings filled the arena. The angry disdain and hatred for God could not be hidden. This hatred was not just from the platform committee (approximately 200 people) it was the expression of the majority of the estimated 5,000 to 6,000 elected delegates representing all fifty states. Also included in this group were unpledged or super delegates. The official DNC website explains who these elite are:

Unpledged delegates make up approximately one-sixth of the total Democratic Party delegates attending a convention. They comprise members of the National Democratic Committee, elected Democratic members of the U.S Senate and House of Representatives, serving Governors, Mayor of the District of Columbia (when applicable), former elected and appointed officials (Presidents, Vice Presidents, Leaders of the U.S. Senate, Speakers of the U.S. House of Representatives, Minority Leaders, Chairs of the Democratic National Committee) and 21 Distinguished Party Leaders.

Observing that ostensible distinguished leaders would be part of, or behind the scenes approving an anti-God stance is disconcerting and presents the real divide in America. The Democratic Party has established and entrenched itself as the anti-God party. (No amount of equivocation or obfuscation can obscure the obvious truth observed by millions.) However, it would be disingenuous to construe that democrats are alone in this regard. The denigration of God and His moral prerogative can be found in members of all political parties. At the moment, the Democratic Party seems to excel in this pursuit. It would serve Mr. Obama—and those Americans who subscribe to his indefensible, deconstructionist view of Scripture, the nature of God and His moral law—to consider the admonition of one of his most outstanding predecessors.

Ronald Regan expressed the truth when he warned: “Where did we begin to lose sight of that noble beginning, of our conviction that standards of right and wrong do exist and must be lived up to? Do we really think that we can have it both ways, that God will protect us in a time of crisis even as we turn away from him in our day-to-day life?”<sup>21</sup> He also presented the real issue that should be at the forefront of the thinking of all Americans whenever they consider their choices

for every public office: “We must be cautious in claiming that God is on our side, I think the real question we must answer is, are we on His side?”<sup>22</sup>

John Adams revealed what is necessary for our Constitutional Republic to continue. Americans must always be vigilant in their responsibility of assessing the moral positions of their elected and appointed representatives. The move from moral law to immoral law is a slippery slope. It begins when compromise is presented as compassion, when God, especially Jesus Christ is deemed irrelevant, if not offensive and when God’s moral law is pressed out of the public awareness by government fiat. These adaptations, justified by a seemingly benign concern for tolerance and equity, are in fact just the opposite.

An essential, fundamental, irrevocable principle of liberty is moral law and it can never be violated without liberty being imperiled. The enemies of liberty are those who reject God’s moral law as the only foundation for equitable civil law. John Witherspoon stated the truth when he said: “Whoever is an avowed enemy to God, I scruple [hesitate] not to call him an enemy to his country.”<sup>23</sup> “We the People” are the watchmen on the towers and the sentinels at the gates, who must stand against liberty’s adversaries. This opposition is not physical but spiritual. Only when the majority of the populace returns to and embraces Biblical moral law will the collapsing of liberty’s foundation be reversed. This was the way with the Founders and Framers and it will always be the only way for every generation of Americans. Pray for America that she would have godly leaders.

The Founders and Framers believed and proclaimed that “Religion, morality and knowledge” are essential “to good government.”<sup>24</sup> Our current sociopolitical condition proves their concern to be valid. Only by understanding the comprehensiveness of the truth they declared, and acting on it, will America be delivered out of this overwhelming crisis. History is a marvelous teacher. ***IRREFUTABLE: Why Christianity Is the Irrevocable Foundation of American Liberty*** fills this vital need.

For more information about ***IRREFUTABLE*** *see endorsements.*

## Home | Articles

### Notes

1. Charles Francis Adams, *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States* (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1851), 9.401.
2. Ibid, 2.510.
3. Barack Obama, *The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream* (Canongate: London, 2007), 224.
4. *Cathedral Age* magazine, ( Washington , DC : Washington National Cathedral, August 21, 2012), “Faith in America.”
5. Joseph Henry Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1889), 48.

6. Obama, *The Audacity of Hope*, 218.
7. Ibid, 219.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid, 218.
11. Ibid, 219.
12. Obama on Faith: The Exclusive God Factor Interview at [http://www.cathleenfalsani.com/?page\\_id=3146](http://www.cathleenfalsani.com/?page_id=3146)
13. Ibid.
14. Obama, *The Audacity of Hope*, 224.
15. Obama on Faith: The Exclusive God Factor Interview at [http://www.cathleenfalsani.com/?page\\_id=3146](http://www.cathleenfalsani.com/?page_id=3146)
16. Ibid.
17. Obama, *The Audacity of Hope*, 222.
18. Ibid.
19. Obama, *The Audacity of Hope*, 93.
20. Ibid, 90.
21. 1984 National Religious Broadcasters Convention
22. 1983 National Religious Broadcasters Convention
23. *The Works of John Witherspoon* (Edinburgh: J. Ogle & M. Ogle, 1815), 5.210.
24. Albert Bushnell Hart, ed., *Liberty Documents*, "The Ordinance of 1787" (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1921), 234.