

**The Important 2016 Elections**  
**Kerby Anderson**  
**Denton Bible Church**  
**October 30, 2016**

---

Today we are going to look at the upcoming election and apply biblical principles and practical evaluation for what many people believe may be the most consequential election of our lifetimes.

We aren't just talking about the presidential election, though that will be a significant part of this message. There are 34 U.S. Senate races and 435 races for the House of Representatives. Also, 44 states will hold elections for their state legislatures. In Texas, for example, there are 31 races for the Texas Senate and 150 races for the Texas House. And 12 states will conduct elections for governor.

Since we will be talking about the election, you might be thinking that it doesn't apply to you since you have already voted. In fact, about 10 million people in this country have already voted early.

I have already voted. But this message will also provide you with a look at the next administration. Either Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump will be the next president. This message will give you an idea of what a Clinton administration will look like and what a Trump administration will look like.

1. How should Christians think about government and our civic duty?

We are citizens of two worlds. Philippians 3:20 - "our citizenship is in heaven."

We also have a citizenship here on earth. John 17:15-18 - we have been sent into the world, and thus have a citizenship here on earth.

We have a citizenship in both heaven and earth.

2. What is our civic responsibility?

Romans 13:1-7 - "Every person is to be in subjection to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God. Therefore whoever resists authority has opposed the ordinance of God; and they who have opposed will receive condemnation upon themselves. For rulers are not a cause of fear for good behavior, but for evil. Do you want to have no fear of authority? Do what is good and you will have praise from the same; for it is a minister of God to you for good. But if you do what is evil, be afraid; for it does not bear the sword for nothing; for it is a minister of God, an avenger who brings wrath on the one who practices evil.

Therefore it is necessary to be in subjection, not only because of wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For because of this you also pay taxes, for *rulers* are servants of God, devoting themselves to this very thing. Render to all what is due them: tax to whom tax *is due*; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.”

1 Peter 2:13 – “Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether to a king as the one in authority.”

Titus 3:1 – “Remind them to be submissive to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good work.”

All of these verses remind us that we must obey those in authority because there is “no authority except from God.” Does that mean we always obey? Of course not. When we are given a command which if obeyed could violate Scripture, then we must not obey. Think of the apostles that said in Act 5:29 that: “We must obey God rather than men.” But in most every case we are called to obey those in authority. Paul even calls those in authority “a minister of God to you for good.”

We not only must obey those in authority, but we are to pray for those in authority. 1 Timothy 2:1-2 says, “First of all, then, I urge that entreaties and prayers, petitions and thanksgivings, be made on behalf of all men, for kings and all who are in authority, so that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and dignity.”

Pray for your **Key 16**

President Barack Obama

Supreme Court Justices (Anthony Kennedy, Clarence Thomas, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, Stephen Breyer, Samuel Alito, John Roberts, Sonia Sotomayer, Elena Kagen)

Senators John Cornyn and Ted Cruz, Representative Sam Johnson

Governor Greg Abbott, State Senator Van Taylor, State Representative Jeff Leach

Obey those in authority, pray for those in authority, and vote for those in authority.

Our first and most fundamental right is that of voting. We elect our own leaders who in turn are responsible for being our representatives in government. We have a civic responsibility to vote. We also have a civic duty to be involved in society (jury duty, contacting our legislators).

### 3. What have Christians done with their stewardship of the vote?

In Matthew 25:14-30, Jesus teaches the parable of the talents. The landowner summoned his three workers and entrusted his property to them. The third worker merely buried his talent. Unfortunately, many Christians have buried their talent.

In the last presidential election (2012), 39 million born-again Christians did not vote. There were 13 million born-again Christians who were not registered to vote, and 26 million who though registered to vote, did not vote.

In 2012, Barack Obama was elected by less than 5 million votes over Mitt Romney. In 2004, George W. Bush was elected by 3 millions votes over John Kerry.

Let me make a football analogy. Imagine if you have a football team and 13 players never put on their uniforms and stayed in the locker room. And then imagine if another 26 players put on their uniform but merely sat on the bench. That is analogous to how millions of Christians approach these elections.

In summary, we should obey those in authority, pray for those in authority, and vote for those in authority.

#### 4. Should pastors and churches even be talking about government and civic duty?

The First Great Awakening was instrumental in laying the foundation for the American Revolution. Jonathan Edwards – revival began in his church in 1734 like a “flash of lightning.” George Whitefield preached up and down the Eastern seaboard. This revival touched 3 out of every 4 colonists.

John Adams wrote “The Meaning of the American Revolution” in 1818. He listed those men responsible for the revival of American principles that led to the American Revolution. Two of the men he mentioned were Dr. Mayhew and Dr. Cooper.

Rev. Jonathan Mayhew, minister of West Church (Boston) and preached a famous sermon about civil disobedience. Dr. Samuel Cooper, minister of the Brattle Street Church (Boston), was pastor to John Hancock, Samuel Adams, and John Adams.

Rev. John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg (Woodstock, Virginia), Lutheran pastor who served in House of Burgesses, preached on Eccl. 3, left church with 300 men from his congregation. He wrote to Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, who originally questioned whether his brother should be involved in politics and even serve in the Continental Army. Both were later elected to Congress.

Pastors and the Constitution - Writers from the founding era cited references more than 3,000 times. Most of the citations were from the Bible (34 percent of the time). About three-fourths of all those references to the Bible came from sermons from that era.

Election Sermons - Pastors would preach an election sermon to guide their congregation.

Sermons on Disasters - In past centuries, pastors would preach sermons after a natural disaster. They would ask what is God trying to teach us through this fire, flood, or tornado.

Preaching on Social Evils - Pastors have been in the forefront of preaching against social evils. Christians were involved in the abolition movement, suffrage movement, and civil rights movement.

### 5. Isn't it illegal for pastors and churches to speak about political issues?

Churches lost many of their legal rights to address candidates and political issues 60 years ago. Lyndon Johnson was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948 by 87 votes. So in 1954 Johnson inserted language into the tax code prohibiting non-profits from endorsing/opposing candidates. That is why many pastors participate in Pulpit Freedom Sunday.

Legal Issues - Churches may not endorse or oppose a particular candidate. And they may not directly contribute to or raise money for a candidate. Churches may register members as voters, pass out voters' guides and speak directly about specific issues and legislation.

### 6. What about the separation of church and state?

Where does the phrase "separation of church and state" appear in the Constitution? The phrase and even the words do NOT appear in the Constitution.

Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to the Danbury Baptist Association in 1802. He used the letter to explain why he did not declare days of public prayer and thanksgiving. In his letter, Thomas Jefferson argued that the President had no authority to proclaim a religious holiday. And he also talked about "building a wall of separation between Church and State."

In 1947, Justice Hugo Black revived the wall metaphor in the case of *Everson v. Board of Education*. He argued that the wall "must be kept high and impregnable." It has been used to ban school prayer, Bible reading, Ten Commandments, prayer before a football game.

### 7. What principles should we use when we determine how to vote?

We need to look at the Four Ps that relates to voting for a candidate: Person, Personnel, Policies, and Platform.

Person – What kind of character does the candidate have? Proverbs 28:6 says, "Better is a poor man who walks in his integrity than a rich man who is crooked in his ways." Proverbs 28:18 adds, "Whoever walks in integrity will be delivered, but he who is crooked in his ways will suddenly fall."

Personnel – for a candidate who will be an executive (President, Governor) we need to look who he or she will put in the cabinet and in executive offices. Who has that candidate surrounded himself or herself in the campaign? Who will be in the executive branch? Proverbs 13:20 say, "Whoever walks with the wise becomes wise."

Policies – What legislative history does he or she have? What policies do they advocate when they speak? What policies on their website do they expect to implement?

Platform – Candidates run within a political party and are expected to hold to the principles set forth in their party’s platform. What is in the party platform?

#### 8. Why should we pay attention to what is in the two party platforms?

Resolutions for the party platform start at the precinct level, and then go to senatorial conventions, state conventions, and the national convention. They represent the hard work of the delegates and represent the ideals of the candidate and the party. It also holds the candidate accountable to the delegates and party leaders who worked hard for their election.

Do party platforms really provide a roadmap for what a candidate might do in office? Go back and look at the 2008 Democratic Party platform and compare it to what President Obama has done on the last eight years (health care, immigration). You will see the blueprint and also the ways the party could hold him accountable.

If you look at the two 2016 party platforms you will see a stark difference between the two parties on many moral and social issues. When George Wallace ran his presidential campaign in 1968, he had the slogan that “there’s not a dime’s worth of difference” between his two opponents (Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey). Actually there was more the ten cents worth of difference back then, and there is a billion dollars worth of difference now.

The October issue of *Outlook*, the Point of View magazine, provides a comparison of the two party platforms. But you can read them for yourself. The 54-page Republican platform and the 52-page Democratic platform are available online.

#### 9. What are some of the differences in the two party platforms?

Let’s look at just five planks in the two party platforms. They are long, so I will summarize them. Where appropriate, I directly quote from them.

##### (a) Abortion

The Republican platform on abortion maintains its pro-life stand and addresses some of the contemporary issues concerning the funding of abortion and the selling of fetal parts from abortion. It also opposes “the use of public funds to perform or promote abortion or to fund organizations, like Planned Parenthood, so long as they provide or refer for elective abortions or sell fetal body parts rather than provide healthcare.”

The Democratic platform focuses on “protecting and advancing reproductive health and rights.” The platform no longer talks about making abortion “safe, legal, and rare.” Instead it calls for the repealing of the Hyde Amendment, which would allow for the

federal funding of abortion. The platform also calls for full funding for Planned Parenthood.

#### (b) Homosexual and Transgender Rights

The Republican platform criticizes the administration for changing the meaning of Title IX in order to advance transgender rights and force states to open bathrooms to people based upon their perceived gender. It argues that this was done “to impose a social and cultural revolution upon the American people by wrongly redefining sex discrimination to include sexual orientation or other categories.”

The Democratic platform wants to give full support to the homosexual and transgender agenda. “We will also fight for comprehensive federal non-discrimination protections for all LGBT Americans.”

#### (c) Immigration

The Republican platform supports the building of a wall, workplace enforcement of verification systems, and a plan to deal with sanctuary cities.

The Democratic platform calls for a path to citizenship and supports the president’s DACA program (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals). It also rejects attempts to impose a religious test for refugees entering the United States.

By the way, if you don’t think these policies have an impact, just look at the Texas border. There has been a surge of immigrants illegally crossing into the United States. On Sundays up to a 1,000 people from Mexico and other Latin American countries pour into McAllen, Texas.

According to a border agent, “The smugglers are telling them if Hillary [Clinton] gets elected, that there’ll be some sort of amnesty, that they need to get here by a certain date,” He also adds, “They’re also being told that if [Donald] Trump gets elected, there’s going to be some magical wall that pops up overnight and once that wall gets up, nobody will ever get in again.”

#### (d) Education

The Republican platform supports every form of education (public, private, home-school) and supports educational choice, by creating education saving accounts, vouchers, and tuition tax credits.

The Democratic platform emphasizes such ideas as free college and greater government involvement in education. It argues that: “every student should be able to go to college debt-free.”

(e) Crime

Republicans in their platform call for the next president to restore the public's truth in law enforcement. It also addresses what it says will "undermine the rule of law on the federal level: Over-criminalization and over-federalization."

Democrats focused their platform on reforming the criminal justice system and reducing the prison population in America. The platform also calls for the complete abolition of the death penalty.

10. What kind of policies would these candidates enact?

We don't have to guess about these policies since nearly every candidate has a website and puts a number of key policy issues on it. The only exception might be judges who do not address specific issues, but they often at least explain their judicial philosophy.

At the presidential level, you have all sorts of policy papers and positions. Just a week ago, Donald Trump released his Contract with the American Voter. Those of you who are older might remember in 1994 what was called the Contract With America. It was written by Newt Gingrich and Dick Armey and included many policy ideas developed at the Heritage Foundation. It included a list of eight reforms the Republicans promised to enact, and ten bills they promised to introduce and vote on if they were made the majority following the election.

He has 6 measures to clean up corruption and special interest. This includes, term limits, a hiring freeze, and a 5-year-ban on government officials becoming lobbyists.

It also has 7 actions to protect American workers. The list includes withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, an attempt to renegotiate NAFTA, and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to label China a currency manipulator.

Donald Trump also promised on his first day in office to take a number of actions to restore security and the constitutional rule of law. They include comments he has made in the past about suspending immigration from terror-prone regions until vetting can be done safely. He would also cancel funding to Sanctuary Cities.

Finally, he puts forth 10 bills that would be introduced into Congress that would address issues like middle class tax relief, Obamacare, and illegal immigration.

11. What about personnel: the people surrounding a candidate?

When you are voting for someone in executive office (president, governor), you must pay attention to the people he or she will put in the cabinet. We often say on my radio program that: "personnel is policy."

You can get some idea by who a presidential candidate picks for Vice President. Hillary Clinton picked Tim Kaine, former governor of Virginia and senator from Virginia. For a time, he served as the head of the Democratic National Committee.

As you would imagine, he shares Hillary Clinton's view on abortion. He has a 100% rating from Planned Parenthood and 100% rating from NARAL Pro-Choice America. He also agrees with Hillary Clinton on all of the LGBT issues. You don't become chairman of the Democratic Party if you don't hold these views.

About the only scandal associated with him was his decision while mayor of Richmond to spend thousands of dollars of public funds to transporting residents to the Million Mom March event in Washington D.C. that some argue was merely an anti-gun rally.

Donald Trump picked Mike Pence. He began working with a public policy group and then was a radio talk show host. He then served in Congress for 12 years and sponsored or cosponsored many pro-life, including an early attempt to defund Planned Parenthood. He now serves as governor of Indiana. He describes himself as first a Christian, second a conservative, and third a Republican.

Because of the influence of Ben Carson and Mike Pence, the Trump campaign also put together an evangelical advisory board. Some of the two dozen people on the board include: James Dobson, David Jeremiah, Michele Bachmann, Robert Jeffress, Jack Graham, James MacDonald, Ralph Reed, James Robison, and Richard Land.

Another important consideration is which people the next president will put in the cabinet. It is quite likely that Hillary Clinton will keep Loretta Lynch as the Attorney General. Many speculate that Donald Trump might pick Rudy Giuliani or Chris Christie as his Attorney General.

Hillary Clinton's campaign has been talking about naming Joe Biden as her Secretary of State. Donald Trump's campaign in the past has talked about putting John Bolton in the position of Secretary of State.

What about the Secretary of Health and Human Services? Under President Obama, you first had Kathleen Sebelius and now have Sylvia Burwell. Kathleen Sebelius was the pro-abortion governor from Kansas. Hillary Clinton would appoint someone similar to this post. Many believe Donald Trump would appoint Dr. Ben Carson to the position of Secretary of Health and Human Services. As you can see, they would appoint very different people to these posts in the cabinet.

Essentially, when you are voting for president, you are voting for a team that will serve the next four years. I think we have all had teams we liked even though we didn't like the coach. We might like the team, but we might not like the owner.

It is also worth mentioning that when you vote for the president, you are really voting for more than 7,000 people. There are more than 4,000 political appointees

who will run the various agencies and departments. And there are more than 3,000 people who will eventually be appointed to federal boards and commissions. And that does not even include the hundreds who will be appointed to the federal judiciary and the Supreme Court.

### 12. What about the Supreme Court?

One of the reasons, perhaps the biggest reason, so many believe this election is important is due to the Supreme Court. For many years, the court has had 4 liberals, 4 conservatives, and a swing vote. The death of Antonin Scalia can change that balance. The next president will immediately be able to appoint one person to the high court. Also, it is worth noting that Ruth Bader Ginsberg is 83, Anthony Kennedy is 80, and Stephen Breyer is 78. The next president may be able to fill up to four vacancies in the Supreme Court and guide the direction of the court for the next three decades.

Who would Hillary Clinton put on the court? Probably she would put people on the court similar to those her husband put on the court (Ruth Bader Ginsberg and Stephen Breyer) and similar to those Barack Obama put on the court (Sonia Sotomayer and Elena Kagen). These are the four liberals on the court.

Who would Donald Trump put on the court? He has put out of list of 21 people he would consider for the Supreme Court and the other federal courts. They come mostly from recommendations made by the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation. These are conservative judges or members of Congress who hold to a strict constructionist view of the Constitution.

Equally important are appointments made to the lower federal courts. They decide 99.83% of the cases. The Supreme Court only hears about 80 cases every year. Important decisions about restricting access to abortion, about gender identity, about religious liberty will be decided in these federal court and circuit courts.

### 13. What's at stake in the Supreme Court?

Another reason so many are paying attention to the presidential election is the impact the next president will have on the Supreme Court because so many of them are narrow (5-4) Supreme Court cases.

The Hobby Lobby case was decided by the high court in 2014. The Department of HHS under the Affordable Care Act required employers to cover certain contraceptives (including abortifacients) for their female employees. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Hobby Lobby by a 5-4 vote.

The Little Sisters of the Poor case in 2016 was similar to the Hobby Lobby case but raised the question of whether religious institutions (other than churches that are already exempt) should be exempt from the HHS contraceptive mandate. The 4-4 Supreme Court vote essentially returned them to their respective courts of appeals for reconsideration.

The court considered the legality of Mojave Memorial Cross in 2010. It was placed on Sunrise Rock in the Mojave Desert put up by the VFW foundation in 1934 to honor war dead. A bag was placed over the cross until the court could rule on the case. The Supreme Court ruled 5-4 that the cross could stay but also sent the case back to a lower court.

The Citizens United case in 2010 challenged the Campaign Reform Act that prevented electioneering communication within 60 days of a general election or 30 days of a primary, and prohibited such expenditures by corporations and unions. A lower court ruled that Citizens United could not advertise a movie critical of Hillary Clinton and could not show it on television within 30 days of the Democratic primaries. The Supreme Court ruled 5-4 that freedom of speech prohibited the government from restricting independent political expenditures by a nonprofit corporation.

Two cases involving the Second Amendment are the Heller case (decided in 2008) and the McDonald case (decided in 2010). In the Heller case, the Supreme Court ruled in a 5-4 decision that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess a firearm for traditionally lawful purposes (such as self-defense within the home). Also, it addressed similar Second Amendment issues in the McDonald case out of Chicago that was also a 5-4 decision.

The Supreme Court also ruled in 2007 on the issue of partial birth abortion. President Bush signed the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act that was then found unconstitutional in a few U.S. District Courts. The Supreme Court upheld the legislation by a vote of 5-4.

#### 14. What about the character of the candidates?

Let's begin by acknowledging that there are some good people running for office in many of the other national and statewide races. This is important since many people will say they can't vote for either Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump, so they won't vote. Even if you can't vote for someone at the top of the ticket, you can still vote for good people running for the legislature and for the courts.

Let's focus on the top of the ticket and start by saying the obvious: these are flawed candidates with significant character issues. One person said the current election reminded him of choosing sides for kickball or basketball. After nearly everyone was chosen, you had the last two kids that neither side wanted. I said it gets worse. One of those two you didn't want will end up being the captain of your team!

It is worth mentioning that there was a time when the American people had great respect for their leaders. During the 1930s and 1940s millions of Americans had a picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt in their homes. In the 1960s many people had a picture of John F. Kennedy in their home. Even in the 1980s there were people who had a picture of Ronald Reagan in their home.

I don't think too many people next year will have a picture of President Hillary Clinton or President Donald Trump in their home. If they do, it might be to tell their kids NOT to turn out like that.

If you don't already know about some of the problems dogging these two candidates, you can find articles that delineate them in some detail. Type in the words "Hillary's 22 Biggest Scandals" and "The Many Scandals of Donald Trump." It will take you awhile to read through all of them.

No doubt you have strong reservations about what both of them have said and done, not only during this campaign, but also over the many years of their lives that have come under scrutiny. When you look at these two candidates, you realize we are facing with what philosophers call a "Hobson's Choice" (named for Thomas Hobson, who ran a livery stable in Cambridge, England). Neither candidate looks very good when it comes to the character issue.

Often that is the nature of elections. If you think about it, you always have to choose the best option when voting for a candidate. I can only think of two times in which I voted for a candidate where I had no difference of opinion. That is when I voted for myself when I ran for precinct chairman! In every other case, I usually had some small or even significant disagreement with the candidate I voted for in an election.

Sometimes I will hear people say they can't vote for a candidate because they disagree with them on a few issues or because they said or did things they disliked. But if you agree with candidate 60% of the time compared to a candidate you only agree with 20% of the time, doesn't it make sense to vote for the candidate that more reflects your values?

#### 15. Should we merely vote for the lesser of two evils?

I have never liked the phrase "vote for the lesser of two evils" for a number of reasons.

First, the word "evil" is already overused. There is real evil in the world, and we don't need to devalue and diminish the word. I weary of hearing people call a group they don't like "a bunch of Nazis." We don't need to say that a political leader is the same as Adolf Hitler. The Nazi regime, the Holocaust, and genocide deserve to be called evil. So let's be careful when we use and often overuse the word "evil."

Second, the problem with the "vote for the lesser of two evils" is that it implies that we are permitted to vote for evil. If you are convinced that someone or some policy is truly evil, then you shouldn't vote for it. But don't be so quick to label a candidate as evil just because you don't like his or her policies or behavior.

What should you do if after hearing all of this you still cannot bring yourself to vote for either of the major party candidates? What if you truly believe it would violate your Christian conscience to vote for either candidate? Does the Bible speak to that issue? I think that it does.

In Romans 14, Paul addresses the issues of meat sacrificed to idols. Although this issue is of no moral concern today, I believe the biblical principles apply here. In Romans 14:14 Paul first makes the case that “nothing is unclean in itself, but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean.” Eating meat sacrificed to idols was morally neutral, but if a person believed that eating was sinful then it was indeed sinful for him or her (14:23).

This principle applies to so many issues where Christians might have a reservation about reading a particular book, seeing a certain movie, or in this case voting for a candidate in the general election. If you believe it would violate your Christian conscience, then you should refrain.

But let me make three points. First, make sure you aren't just coming to this position because you disagree with a few positions held by a candidate. I have met people who have said they wouldn't vote for a candidate because of one or two votes cast by the candidate that they didn't like. We need a little more discernment than that.

Second, if you can't vote for the candidates at the top of the ticket, that still is not a good excuse for not voting. On my ballot there were 25 races from president to U.S. Representative to State Senate to State House all the way down to Constable. You cannot tell me that you have moral objections to voting for ALL of the rest of the people down the ballot.

Third, we should not have a judgmental attitude to others. Paul addresses that in Romans 14:4 that asks: “Who are you to pass judgment on the servant of another? It is before his own master that he stands or falls.” Even if you cannot vote for a candidate, that doesn't mean that another believer can't vote for that same candidate based upon his or her convictions. Look at all the arguments on Facebook right now where Christians derisively ask, “How can you as a Christian vote for [fill in the blank]?” We should be more charitable to one another even if we disagree about certain candidates.

One other question might be on your mind. If you can't vote for the two presidential candidates, why not vote for a third party candidate? Let's inject some reality: neither Gary Johnson (Libertarian Party) nor Jill Stein (Green Party) will be the next president. You are free to cast your vote that way if you want, but your vote will not determine who sits in the Oval Office in January.

Perhaps you have heard people say that a vote for a third party candidate is a vote for Hillary Clinton because it takes away a vote for Donald Trump or vice versa. Technically that is true, but realistically it is false. A vote for a third party candidate is a vote for a third party candidate. But realistically, if someone planned to vote for Donald Trump and then voted for Gary Johnson, that vote was essentially taken away from the total votes Donald Trump would have received.

That might not make a difference in Texas. Four years ago, Mitt Romney received more than a million more votes than Barack Obama. Most analysts believe Donald Trump will win Texas, but not by that margin. We just don't know.

Voting for a third party candidate in a swing state like Ohio or Florida would certainly make a difference. Al Gore lost the state of Florida and the 2000 election by 537 votes. The more than 97,000 votes cast for third party candidate Ralph Nader most assuredly handed the victory to George W. Bush.

In conclusion, I realize this may be more information than you might have wanted, and that was my point. I hear people say or I read people on Facebook write that they are voting for a candidate because she is a woman or voting for a candidate because he is businessman. We Christians need to think more deeply about how to vote and what to expect after November. I sincerely doubt you have heard this level of analysis anywhere except right here at Denton Bible Church. So let me thank Tommy Nelson and Charles Stolfus for inviting me to be with you today.