

# Endorsements

*"Every pastor hopes that the people who sit and listen every week 'get it'. After years observing Justin Derby, and having the privilege to watch him mature as a believer and now as a writer, I can say with no hesitation, Justin 'gets it'. Another Inconvenient Truth: What Secular America Hates is a clear, concise, passionate push-back against the spirit of the age. With wisdom well past his years, and with dogged determination, Justin goes right at the pressing issues of our day, with an unwavering commitment to the unchanging inerrant Word of God. True lovers of truth will find this book extremely helpful."*

--Dr. Jim Jenkins

Founder of *The Jude 3 Fellowship*, and author of *Fatal Drift: Is The Church Losing it's Anchor?*

*"Our world today as we know it is decaying fast and most Christians are beginning to be conformed to the world, forgetting that we are supposed to continually lift up the blood stained banner of Jesus Christ in a decaying world."*

*In this timely revelation, Another Inconvenient Truth: What Secular America Hates, Justin Derby has once again, like the prophets of old, called on all Christians to be aware of the devices of the devil.*

*The Evil one, that old serpent, has a properly designed strategy to completely take God away from our society through the teachings of humanism/atheism incorporated into our belief system. Justin Derby, in his expository book, has opened my eyes to the master plan of the devil to turn the younger generation away from God through academic indoctrination, scientific arguments and experimentation. This book, Another Inconvenient Truth, is not for the weak, it's for those who will love the world and deny our Master and his word.*

*If we are to stop the gates of hell from prevailing in our world today, then every child of God needs to wake up to the truths revealed in this timely classic. This is a must read for every child of God who wants to see the kingdom of God established on earth."*

--Jemima Amos,

Christian Writer and Editor

*"Justin Derby's latest book, Another Inconvenient Truth, is a concise expose' of the clearly stated, and deliberate, plans haters of Jesus have been perpetrating right under our noses for decades. Derby describes the Atheist agenda being enacted, with their own words, and concludes the response of Christ expertly from Scripture. We may have left monsters unchallenged and society in a shambles, as a result, but the haters of God are too blind to see the 'inconvenient truth'. Derby shows us: God wins. Christians are NOT blind. We are SUPPOSED to see; we are supposed to defy the Lies. We are of the Solution - And this is the most chilling fact of all. We've all been acting like blind men for far too long. Christians must defy the lie with, 'discernment and fidelity to the truth', knowing we are in the battles of a war already won by our Commander. Be, therefore, very courageous.*

*I will using this resource for a long time to come."*

--Patrick J. Burwell

Director of *OnlyJesusSaves.com Ministries*, and author of *For The Love of Truth*.

# Another Inconvenient Truth

What Secular America Hates

Justin Derby

@Copyright 2014 Justin Derby  
All Rights reserved

Book Cover Design: Jasmine W. (Can be contacted at <https://www.fiverr.com/jw12792>)

Book Editor: Jemima Amos (Can be contacted at <https://www.fiverr.com/wewrite2014>)

Unless otherwise designated, all scripture quotations come from the 2011 NIV Study Bible by  
Zondervan.

All sources and resources printed in this book are offered strictly as resources. The author does not  
vouch for every single little bit of content in these sources and resources

ISBN: 978-0-9862430-0-4

# Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my mom and dad for giving me a solid starting foundation for my faith when I was growing up.

I would like to thank Dr. Jim Jenkins for faithfully preaching the Word of God for all those years that you were my pastor at the Cottage Grove Faith Center, and for showing me that I'm not alone in recognizing the signs of what's coming ahead.

I would like to thank Jasmine W. for creating such an attention-grabbing cover for my book; it really caught the eye of everyone who I showed it to, as a cover created by the best cover artist on Fiverr.com should.

I would like to thank Jemima Amos for editing my book; it's always great to have an extra set of eyes look to pick up all the little mistakes that my eyes had missed.

I would like to thank my friend Eva Klassen for being a sweet and loyal friend, for sticking with me through all the ups and downs of my life, and for supporting me on this project.

Finally, I would like to thank Jesus of Nazareth for showing me the truth about reality, and for choosing to save me even though I'm a wicked wretch not worthy of being saved. May you always help me to grow in truth and reject error.

# Introduction

Raised up in this country as a follower of Jesus of Nazareth, I'm seeing things I never thought I would see as a young adult: the medical community talking about legalizing infanticide, the scientific community clinging to theories that contradict everything we observe in the universe, the homosexual community trying to force everyone to accept their lifestyle despite the fact that the most recent studies say that living the homosexual lifestyle is the surest way to get STDs and is not good for children, and American Christianity saying that followers of Jesus who believe what the bible says about sin are not mainstream Christians, but are just extremist fringe people. The saddest part of it all is that America's founding fathers founded this country on Christian principles, and because we rejected those principles, we have become what the founding fathers said we would become if we rejected those principles.

As it happened back in the first century in the days of the eyewitnesses of Jesus, many who call themselves believers have put the opinions of man over the righteous commands of God, and conform to the culture around them. As our culture continues to become more pagan and corrupt, such supposed believers will continue to adopt and conform to the culture around them, and many who call themselves believers think that God will rapture them out of the world before the one-world government comes into being and the Anti-Christ come into power.

These claims I made sound radical, hard to believe, and even offensive, but after you've finished reading this book and have looked at all the evidence I'm about to trot out, I strongly believe that you'll see that I was speaking the truth.

Some of you might be wondering why I'm writing this book, and why I'm taking things in this

direction. there are a number of reasons: the first is that the scriptures command us to be apologists on some level; the apostle Peter told us to *“Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect...”* (1 Peter 3:15). The apostle Paul tells us that *“We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ.”* (2 Corinthians 10:5). The Lord himself said, *“Come now, and let us reason together...”* (Isaiah 1:18 (KJV)), which clearly implies that the Lord is a reasonable being who wants us to use our reason. Even Jesus told us to *“...‘Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.’ This is the first and greatest commandment.”* (Matthew 22:37-38).

The second reason this book is important is that the majority of our societal make-up is formed by the humanists/atheists who control our academic culture. These people, as I will show later in the book, have no interest in teaching you the truth about reality; they are far more interested in making sure you convert to atheism/humanism and reject any notions of religion or God, and because this is their goal, they have no problems with lying to students and young adults about anything in science and history in order to accomplish that goal. King Solomon pointed out that if we know the truth about reality, *“Then you will understand what is right and just and fair—every good path. For wisdom will enter your heart, and knowledge will be pleasant to your soul. Discretion will protect you, and understanding will guard you.”* (Proverbs 2:9-11).

The third reason this book is important is that by having a solid grasp of scientific and historical knowledge, and having a proper understanding of what the Bible says and teaches, we can become the kind of apologists and evangelists who can reach a hypocritical society that claims to be on the side of truth on one hand, and then by their actions deny the truth on the other.

The fourth reason this book is important is that with the help of the atheists/humanists who have been controlling our academic culture for the past 110 years, we're taught that if you come to a conclusion that differs from the societal narrative that the people in power have constructed, you will be ridiculed, marginalized, and ultimately silenced if you persist in going against the societal narrative. Even if you can show that Biblical Christianity is true beyond a reasonable doubt, it will only be seen as an inconvenient truth that is in the way of the agenda our society wants to accomplish.

While the last reason may make apologetics seem like a daunting and pointless task, it's not as bad as it seems. Not only did Jesus command us all to go out and make disciples of all nations in the Great Commission, but he also told us that “...*In this world you will have trouble. But take heart! I have overcome the world.*” (John 16:33). As we begin looking at the evidence supporting my opening assertions, let us not forget what Jesus told his disciples in John 15:18-25:

*“If the world hates you, keep in mind that it hated me first. If you belonged to the world, it would love you as its own. As it is, you do not belong to the world, but I have chosen you out of the world. That is why the world hates you. Remember what I told you: ‘A servant is not greater than his master.’ If they persecuted me, they will persecute you also. If they obeyed my teaching, they will obey yours also. They will treat you this way because of my name, for they do not know the one who sent me. If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not be guilty of sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin. Whoever hates me hates my Father as well. If I had not done among them the works no one else did, they would not be guilty of sin. As it is, they have seen, and yet they have hated both me and my Father. But this is to fulfill what is written in their Law: ‘They hated me without reason.’”*



# Chapter 1

## Our Right To Exist Is Fading Away

The current paradigm in our society tells us that if having a child is inconvenient for you, it's ok to murder your child while it's in the womb; but if you feel this way after it is born, then you can't do it. I have no doubt that many people think that will never change, but as I am about to show you, change is on the horizon.

In an article titled “After-birth abortion: why should the baby live?” in the February 23, 2012 issue of the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, authors Alberto Giubilini and Francesca Minerva write the following as their abstract:

*“Abortion is largely accepted even for reasons that do not have anything to do with the fetus' health. By showing that (1) both fetuses and newborns do not have the same moral status as actual persons, (2) the fact that both are potential persons is morally irrelevant and (3) adoption is not always in the best interest of actual people, the authors argue that what we call ‘after-birth abortion’ (killing a newborn) should be permissible in all the cases where abortion is, including cases where the newborn is not disabled.”*

That's right; your eyes do not deceive you: Giubilini and Minerva are making an argument that would legalize infanticide for any and every reason.

When I first showed this article to a bunch of atheists in a Facebook group that I was in back in 2013, they accused me of lying and claimed that this article was satirical, that there was no way an argument like this would ever get through the peer-review process in any academic circle. Of course, this journal is an international peer-reviewed journal for health professionals and researchers in medical ethics, and in it, we have so-called medical experts making an argument that infanticide (dubbed “after-birth abortion”) should be just as legal as regular abortion.

In support of points one and two of their abstract, Giubilini and Minerva write the following:

*"Both a fetus and a newborn certainly are human beings and potential persons, but neither is a 'person' in the sense of 'subject of a moral right to life'. We take 'person' to mean an individual who is capable of attributing to her own existence some (at least) basic value such that being deprived of this existence represents a loss to her. This means that many non-human animals and mentally retarded human individuals are persons, but that all the individuals who are not in the condition of attributing any value to their own existence are not persons. Merely being human is not in itself a reason for ascribing someone a right to life."*

According to these authors, a human being is not a real person until their minds develop to the point where they are able to give value to their own existence. How is it possible for someone to give their own existence value when, according to Giubilini and Minerva, being human doesn't give you a right to life? Giubilini and Minerva answer that question with the following illustration:

*"It is true that a particular moral status can be attached to a non-person by virtue of the value an actual person (eg, the mother) attributes to it. However, this 'subjective' account of the moral status*

*of a newborn does not debunk our previous argument. Let us imagine that a woman is pregnant with two identical twins who are affected by genetic disorders. In order to cure one of the embryos the woman is given the option to use the other twin to develop a therapy. If she agrees, she attributes to the first embryo the status of 'future child' and to the other one the status of a mere means to cure the 'future child'. However, the different moral status does not spring from the fact that the first one is a 'person' and the other is not, which would be nonsense, given that they are identical. Rather, the different moral statuses only depends on the particular value the woman projects on them. However, such a projection is exactly what does not occur when a newborn becomes a burden to its family."*

According to Giubilini and Minerva, a human being does not have "a right to life" unless another human being decides that they do! Who gives these guys the right to play God? What gives these guys the right to arbitrarily decide who lives and who dies, to decide which humans are actual humans and which ones are merely "potential persons", as if they're sub-human creatures?

In support of point three in their abstract, Giubilini and Minerva say the following:

*"We have previously discussed the argument from potentiality, showing that it is not strong enough to outweigh the consideration of the interests of actual people. Indeed, however weak the interests of actual people can be, they will always trump the alleged interest of potential people to become actual ones, because this latter interest amounts to zero. On this perspective, the interests of the actual people involved matter, and among these interests, we also need to consider the interests of the mother who might suffer psychological distress from giving her child up for adoption. Birthmothers are often reported to experience serious psychological problems due to the inability to elaborate their loss and to cope with their grief. It is true that grief and sense of loss may accompany both abortion*

*and after-birth abortion as well as adoption, but we cannot assume that for the birthmother the latter is the least traumatic. For example, 'those who grieve a death must accept the irreversibility of the loss, but natural mothers often dream that their child will return to them. This makes it difficult to accept the reality of the loss because they can never be quite sure whether or not it is irreversible'."*<sup>1</sup>

Apparently, the rights of an actual person (someone who is developed enough mentally to give their own existence value) trump the rights of a potential person; the reason this is so is because the authors arbitrarily claim that the potential person has no interests of their own.

The reason that Giubilini and Minerva say that adoption is not a viable option is that the birth mother, if she were to give up her baby for adoption, might miss her baby, and she might wonder or dream about if her child were to return to her one day, and that might cause her some stress in her life.

According to the Child Welfare Information Gateway website (which is run by our federal government), roughly 1.4 million children were born to unmarried women in 2003, making up 34.6 percent of the total births in our country. If the relinquishment rate of 0.9 percent measured by the National Survey of Family Growth in 1995 were applied to all unmarried women who gave birth in 2003, this would mean that fewer than 14,000 children were put up for adoption in 2003.<sup>2</sup> Kristi Burton Brown, a pro-life attorney volunteering for Life Legal Defense Foundation and an allied attorney for Alliance Defending Freedom, had this to say:

*"Clearly, this is a very sad – and I would say epidemic – situation. Many good, loving families are waiting throughout our nation for a baby whom they want to cherish, value, and raise for the rest of that baby's life. Instead of babies going to these families, they go into a trash heap or down a garbage*

*disposal. Why do mothers feel that killing their children is a better option than choosing families for their children?"* <sup>3</sup>

I can answer that question, Kristi: It's people like Giubilini and Minerva telling us for decades that babies in the womb and newborns are not real human beings, and because being human doesn't give you a right to life, the rights of the mother always trump the rights of the child. In that same vein, they've arbitrarily decided that abortion is better than adoption, and because people like them have been shoving these arbitrary ideas down the throats and into the minds of women for the past several decades, you're seeing fewer and fewer women giving up their children for adoption if they don't want to raise them.

Unfortunately, in a blog post that was posted shortly after the publication of Giubilini and Minerva's article, Julian Savulescu, the Editor of the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, wrote the following in defense of their decision to publish the article:

*"Many people will and have disagreed with these arguments. However, the goal of the Journal of Medical Ethics is not to present the Truth or promote some one moral view. It is to present well reasoned argument based on widely accepted premises. The authors provocatively argue that there is no moral difference between a fetus and a newborn. Their capacities are relevantly similar. If abortion is permissible, infanticide should be permissible. The authors proceed logically from premises which many people accept to a conclusion that many of those people would reject."* <sup>4</sup>

## God's Judgement of the Canaanites

I already know what the atheist/humanist is thinking at this point: “How come we can't make arbitrary decisions like that when God made arbitrary decisions all the time in the Old Testament? He killed people all the time; he's the biggest mass murderer in all of history!” The main evidence they use to support that assertion is God's judgment of the Canaanites in the Old Testament. The question is, did God arbitrarily decide to wipe out the Canaanites, or did he have reasons for why he did it?

What did the Canaanites do to earn God's wrath? The Canaanites worshiped a god called Moloch (Molek in the Old Testament). The Canaanites burned their children alive as sacrifices in honor of him, and practiced sodomy, bestiality, and all sorts of loathsome vice as forms of worshiping Molek.

Leviticus 18:21-24: *Do not give any of your children to be sacrificed to Molek, for you must not profane the name of your God. I am the Lord. Do not have sexual relations with a man as one does with a woman; that is detestable. Do not have sexual relations with an animal and defile yourself with it. A woman must not present herself to an animal to have sexual relations with it; that is a perversion. Do not defile yourselves in any of these ways, because this is how the nations that I am going to drive out before you became defiled.*

God makes it clear that he wants the Israelites to have nothing to do with the Canaanite's worship of Molek:

Leviticus 20:1-5: *“The Lord said to Moses, 'Say to the Israelites: “Any Israelite or any foreigner*

*residing in Israel who sacrifices any of his children to Molek is to be put to death. The members of the community are to stone him. I myself will set my face against him and will cut him off from his people; for by sacrificing his children to Molek, he has defiled my sanctuary and profaned my holy name. If the members of the community close their eyes when that man sacrifices one of his children to Molek and if they fail to put him to death, I myself will set my face against him and his family and will cut them off from their people together with all who follow him in prostituting themselves to Molek.”””*

Because of God's anger over the evil religious practices of the Canaanites, God ordered King Saul to attack the Amalekites (a sub-group within the Canaanite people):

1 Samuel 15:1-3: *“Samuel said to Saul, 'I am the one the Lord sent to anoint you king over his people Israel; so listen now to the message from the Lord. This is what the Lord Almighty says: “I will punish the Amalekites for what they did to Israel when they waylaid them as they came up from Egypt. Now go, attack the Amalekites and totally destroy all that belongs to them. Do not spare them; put to death men and women, children and infants, cattle and sheep, camels and donkeys.”””*

Moses says the following within an explanation of God's rules for them when going to war:

Deuteronomy 20:16-18: *“However, in the cities of the nations the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance, do not leave alive anything that breathes. Completely destroy them—the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites—as the Lord your God has commanded you. Otherwise, they will teach you to follow all the detestable things they do in worshiping their gods, and you will sin against the Lord your God.”*

At this point, it seems that the God of the Old Testament rightly calls out the evil of the Canaanites, but the mercy and forgiveness of the New Testament God seems to not exist. I can already hear all the atheists/humanists saying, "See! The God of the Old Testament is way different from the God of the New Testament! He murdered all the Canaanites!" There's just one problem: the Canaanites keep reappearing in the story.

After God told Saul to wipe out the Amalekites in 1 Samuel 15:1-3 and the battle had been fought, the Amalekites reappear:

1 Samuel 27:8-9: *"Then David said to Achish, 'If I have found favor in your eyes, let a place be assigned to me in one of the country towns, that I may live there. Why should your servant live in the royal city with you?'"*

*So on that day Achish gave him Ziklag, and it has belonged to the kings of Judah ever since. David lived in Philistine territory a year and four months. Now David and his men went up and raided the Geshurites, the Girzites and the Amalekites. (From ancient times these peoples had lived in the land extending to Shur and Egypt.) Whenever David attacked an area, he did not leave a man or woman alive, but took sheep and cattle, donkeys and camels, and clothes. Then he returned to Achish."*

David had another encounter with the Amalekites in 1 Samuel 30:1-18, and Haman from the book of Esther was the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, whose ancestor was Agag, who can be read about in 1 Samuel 15:7-34.



Because of the fact that the Canaanites reappear later on in the story, it becomes clear that the Israelites did not wipe out every Canaanite man, woman, and child. The question then becomes, what does the phrase “men, women, and children” and other similar phrases mean?

Dr. Richard S. Hess, professor of Old Testament and Semantic Languages at Denver Seminary, deals with this very issue in his article *The Jericho and Ai of the Book of Joshua*. Here is what Dr. Hess had to say:

*This text appears to include women, children, and the aged in this mass destruction. However, is this really the case? The actual expression is translated, 'men and women,' literally, 'from man (and) unto woman.' The phrase occurs elsewhere seven times, referring to the inhabitants of Ai ( Josh 8:25), Amalek (1 Sam 15:3, here without the waw), Nob (1 Sam 22:19), Jerusalem during David's time (2 Sam 6:19 = 1 Chr 16:3), Jerusalem during Ezra's time (Neh 8:2), and Israel (2 Chr 15:13). In 2 Sam 6:19 (= 1 Chr 16:3) it describes the joyful occasion of David's entrance into Jerusalem with the ark of the covenant and his distributing food to all the onlookers. Except for Saul's extermination of the inhabitants of Nob in 1 Sam 22:19, where children are specifically mentioned (unlike the texts about Jericho, Ai, and elsewhere), all other appearances of the phrase precede or follow the Hebrew kol 'all, everyone.' Thus, the phrase appears to be stereotypical for describing all the inhabitants of a town or region, without predisposing the reader to assume anything further about their ages or even their genders. It is synonymous with 'all, everyone.'”<sup>5</sup>*

Dealing with the same issue in his article *How Could God Command Killing the Canaanites?*,

## Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

