## ABiblicalView.com by John Holbrook Jr. © Blog D119 – Draft 2020-09-09, edited 2021-03-10

## **K3-Veto Voting on the Basis of Issues**

by John Holbrook Jr.

A Biblical View, Blog #119 posted September 9, 2020, edited March 10, 2021.

As I explained in my blog of August 14, 2020, in recent years I have experienced increasing difficulty finding candidates for public office whom I regard as desirable – particularly the candidates for the presidency. As a result, I have practiced what I call "veto-voting" – i.e. I have voted *against* the candidates whom I regard as least desirable.

In evaluating candidates, I believe that whether or I like a candidate's demeanor, discourse, and deportment is far less important than whether or not I like his or her stance on important issues. Moreover, as a Christian, I believe that I need to be guided in my choices by what God has said about these issues. If I find that a candidates views do not align with God's views, then I must not vote for him or her - e.g. if a candidate approves of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in 1973 to give mothers the right to murder the babies in their wombs, I must not vote for that candidate under any circumstances. I would regard doing so as a serious sin because God has condemned murder in such clear and certain terms – particularly the murder of the unborn.

Here is a table showing a series of issues which I regard as important and which shows what God, the Democratic Party, and the Republican Party have to say about them. Before anyone, but particularly a Christian, steps into a voting booth on November 3, 2020, he or she should have a firm grasp or understanding of what this table reveals.

	ISSUES	GOD	DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
1	Legitimizing abortion <sup>1</sup>	Con <sup>2</sup>	Pro <sup>3</sup>	Con <sup>4</sup>
2	Legitimizing same-sex marriage <sup>5</sup>	Con	Pro <sup>6</sup>	Con <sup>7</sup>
3	Legitimizing parenting by same-sex couples	Con	Pro <sup>8</sup>	Con <sup>9</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Affirmed by U.S. Supreme Court's *Rove vs. Wade* decision (1973).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Genesis 1:27; Job 31:15; Psalms 8:5-7, 22:10, 127:3-5, & 139:13-16; Isaiah 49:15; and Jeremiah 1:5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Protecting Women's Rights, Democratic Party Platform (2020), page 42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Rather support the exercise of the Constitution's 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights. Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Affirmed by U.S. Supreme Court's *Obergefell vs, Hodge* decision (2015).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Protecting LGBTO+ Rights, Democratic Party Platform (2020), page 42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Rather protect the traditional definition of marriage as a covenant between a man and a woman and the traditional nature of the family. Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Protecting LGBTQ+ Rights, Democratic Party Platform (2020), page 42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Rather protect the traditional definition of marriage as a covenant between a man and a woman and the traditional nature of the family. Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020)...

## ABiblicalView.com by John Holbrook Jr. © Blog D119 – Draft 2020-09-09, edited 2021-03-10

4	Legitimizing LGBTQ+ etc. behavior <sup>10</sup>	Con 11	Pro <sup>12</sup>	Con <sup>13</sup>
5	Criminalizing the refusal to provide services to LGBTQs <sup>14</sup>	Con	Pro <sup>15</sup>	Con <sup>16</sup>
6	Legitimizing illegal aliens	Con <sup>17</sup>	Pro <sup>18</sup>	Con <sup>19</sup>
7	Appointing judges who engage in <i>judicial</i> activism <sup>20</sup> to the Supreme Court & federal district courts <sup>21</sup>	Con	Pro <sup>22</sup>	Con <sup>23</sup>
8	Legitimizing the libeling of public officials <sup>24</sup>	Con <sup>25</sup>	Pro	Con <sup>26</sup>
9	Legitimizing gender- choice <sup>27</sup>	Con	Pro <sup>28</sup>	Con <sup>29</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Gradually affirmed by series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions: One, Inc. vs. Olesen decision (1958), Baker vs. Nelson decision (1972), Bowers vs. Hardwick decision (1986), Romer vs. Evans decision (1996), Boy Scouts of America vs. Dale decision (1996), Lawrence vs. Texas decision (2003), United States vs. Windsor decision (2013), Obergefell vs. Hodges decision (2015), and Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission decision (2018).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Leviticus 18:24-28; Romans 1:32; 1 Corinthians 6:9; and Ephesians 5:6-12.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Protecting LGBTQ+ Rights, Democratic Party Platform (2020), page 42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Struck down by U.S. Supreme Court *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission* decision (2018) with limitations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Protecting LGBTQ+ Rights, Democratic Party Platform (2020), page 42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Rather support the exercise of the Constitution's 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights - Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Deuteronomy 32:8, Acts 17:26.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Democratic Party Platform (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> I define *judicial activism* as substituting (a) what one wishes a law to say for (b) what the legislators who enacted the law wanted it to say, which is seldom unclear. It might also be called *judicial legislation* or even *judicial tyranny*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> The U.S. Supreme Court has been engaging in judicial activism flagrantly and more frequently in recent years with no sign that the Legislative Branch of the government might reign them in.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Democrats have consistently promoted the appointment of liberal judges who disregard what the Constitution actually says and find ephemeral reasons for writing decisions that represent their own liberal opinions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Rather support the appointment of constitutionalists to the bench. Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Affirmed by U.S. Supreme Court's New York Times vs. Sullivan decision (1964) with qualifications.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Exodus 20:16, Romans 13:1-7...

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Mostly affirmed by U.S. Supreme Court's *Bostock vs. Clayton County, Georgia* decision (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Protecting LGBTO+ Rights, Democratic Party Platform (2020), page 42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

## ABiblicalView.com by John Holbrook Jr. © Blog D119 – Draft 2020-09-09, edited 2021-03-10

10	Legitimizing open	Con 30	Pro <sup>31</sup>	Con <sup>32</sup>
	(porous) borders			

In the footnotes to the above table, I have tried to provide references which substantiate my choice of *pro* or *con*. I must admit that some candidates do not always share the position of his or her party on every issue. At the same time, the higher the office involved, the more safely one can presume such.

Some Christians may find fault with my attempt here to influence the political decisions of others. They argue that Christians should devote their energy solely to prayer and leave the rest to God. My response to such arguments is that God tells us both to pray and to act. Moreover, I regard the idea of praying to God to put an end to legalized abortion and then voting for a candidate that favors legalized abortion as the epitome of hypocrisy. Where in the Scriptures do these Christians find a basis for doing so?

God has created all individuals and all nations, and he expects them to honor him and obey his commandments (see Deuteronomy 28). As a result, he expects his people to insist that their nations base their laws on his laws. Moreover, he tells us, who should respect God's Word, that when we find ourselves in a battle with people who reject God's Word, we should (a) wrap ourselves in the protective clothing and equipment that he has given to us, (b) pick up the only weapon that he tells us to carry, and (c) venture forth onto the field of battle to oppose what he has defined as evil, all the while praying without ceasing for his help in doing so.

Therefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girded about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness, and your feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace. Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.... (KJ21 Ephesians 6:13-18) <sup>33</sup>

© 2020 John	Holbrook Jr.	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Deuteronomy 32:8, Acts 17:26.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Creating a 21st Century Immigration System, Democratic Party Platform (2020), page 61.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Republican Party Platform (2016, 2020) & President Trump's Second Term Agenda (2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> By "saints" is meant sinners who acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as their Savior and Lord. He is both the Son-of-God and the "KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS" (KJV Revelation 19:16).