



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 28, 2017

## Left Uses Bible to Attack Trump Budget

It may seem strange from a political party that booed the inclusion of God in its platform in 2012, but leading Democrats are not above citing the Bible to attack the Trump budget — specifically the proposed cut to the “Meals on Wheels” program, or the National Endowment for the Arts.

Demonstrating vividly William Shakespeare’s famous quotation from his play “The Merchant of Venice,” in which it was said, “The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose,” liberals attacking the proposal to cut out a wealth transfer program have resorted to the Bible to make their case.



Of course, the Left is in the vanguard of keeping the Bible out of the hands of little school children — often even suing the Gideons when they pass out free New Testaments to grade school kids. They are not even above dismissing the Bible as just “an ancient text,” no longer applicable for today, when they wish to refute its admonitions against homosexual behavior. In 2012, CNN commentator Piers Morgan even argued, “How literally should people take the Bible? And should the Bible be an evolutionary thing, rather like the Constitution was amended a few times?”

But after conservative commentator Erick Erickson dared to defend the Trump budget’s elimination of Meals on Wheels, he was charged with being heartless and even in violation of the tenets of that non-amended Bible. And it was not just liberal Democrats; some Republican liberals piled on, as well. Matthew Dowd, George Bush’s chief political consultant in 2004 and now an analyst for ABC, tweeted, “Please stop. You embarrass all of us who call ourselves Christians.”

The verse often cited by those who argue in favor of government-sponsored charity (such as Meals on Wheels) is Matthew 25:40, which states, “Whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.” While there is some debate among theologians as to whether that verse was making reference to the poor generally, or just to fellow Christians, it is certainly true that even Mother Teresa herself quoted the verse to explain her devotion to the poor in Calcutta.

Of course, that is the point. Christians look upon biblical commands to help the less fortunate as their own responsibility. They do not see such biblical verses as a call to force others to help the poor. Erickson said as much: “There is no dispute on helping the poor. The Bible commands it, but does not lay out how or if government programs are required. It is clearly a personal obligation of believers and the church community.”

Meals on Wheels is a fine program. But why cannot it not be funded privately?

No verses can be found in the Bible that command a believer to steal from someone else in order to help the poor. One of the Ten Commandments is “Thou shalt not steal.” Stealing, even in order to help someone else, would still be stealing.

Recently, Representative Joseph Kennedy III (D-Mass.) piously responded to efforts to repeal



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 28, 2017

---

ObamaCare, asserting that the Matthew 25:40 verse “reminds us that we are judged not by how we treat the powerful, but by how we care for the least among us.” Does that mean the powerful, such as Kennedy’s powerful uncle, Senator Edward Kennedy, who was able to escape serious punishment in the Chappaquiddick Affair, in which Mary Jo Kopechne was left in the water in Kennedy’s Oldsmobile for nine hours?

Yet, whenever someone dares to quote Scripture to challenge abortion or same-sex marriage, the Left storms that this an effort to “impose” religious views on society, supposedly in violation of the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause.

While the Left will sometimes twist biblical references to support certain social policies, their main utilization of Scripture involves economic issues, and questions about wealth redistribution. For example, Anthony Stevens-Arroyo of the *Washington Post* has argued that the Bible was the inspiration for Karl Marx’s famous statement “From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.” Never mind that Marx was an atheist who compared religion to a drug that dulls the senses of the workers and keeps them from overthrowing the government and establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat [workers].

Stevens-Arroyo, a supporter of the leftist Liberation Theology, claimed, “The ideal ‘from each according to his ability; to each according to his need,’ doesn’t originate with Marx. It comes from the Acts of the Apostles.” His allusion is to Acts 4:34-35, which tells of the early Christians selling their possessions to provide for their destitute fellow believers. Actually, this story argues against government transfer of wealth. This was not the Roman government or the Jewish authorities who were taking possessions by force; it was all voluntary.

The Apostle Peter explicitly says this in Acts 5:4. Ananias had claimed to have given all the proceeds from a sale for poor Christians, although he had kept back some of the proceeds. Peter told him, “While it remained, was it not your own? And after it was sold, was it not in your control?”

President Barack Obama, who modernized Marx’s famous quotation, told Joe the Plumber that it helps everybody to “spread the wealth around,” and he has argued that the Bible justifies government taking from some to give to others, saying, “I am my brother’s keeper.”

Actually, when it comes to being a brother’s “keeper,” and helping “the least of these,” liberals are much less likely to pull out their own wallets or checkbooks to help the poor than are conservatives. A 2006 study by the American Enterprise Institute’s Arthur Brooks demonstrated this truth, and other studies have confirmed it. Liberals are very generous — with someone else’s money.

The Bible does not advocate living off welfare, when one is capable of working. In II Thessalonians 3:10, the Apostle Paul stated, “He who does not work should not eat.”

Jesse Jackson is a good example of a man who uses the Bible selectively to make leftist points. He has even argued that “Jesus was an Occupier.” Why? According to Jackson, when Jesus drove the moneychangers from the Temple, that was proof that He would support occupation of public places. Lisa Miller, a contributor to the Religious Left site “On Faith,” agreed that Jesus would support the Occupy movement.

Jackson has a long history of distorting Bible stories to advance various liberal goals. In 1992, while speaking to the Democratic National Convention, he even claimed, “Jesus was born to a homeless couple.” Actually, Mary and Joseph had travelled from their home in Nazareth to Bethlehem. They were no more homeless than a married couple renting a hotel room while staying in another state. If



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 28, 2017

---

anything, the Bible story of the journey to Bethlehem is an example of the heavy hand of government extracting taxes: Joseph was there for a census, ordered by the emperor, Augustus Caesar, to determine how much he owed in taxes.

Jackson even had the audacity to extrapolate from this story, “Jesus was the child of a single mother.” This is also not true, as Mary and Joseph were legally married under the Jewish law of the time.

Of course, Jackson is not alone in such ridiculous assertions. One liberal activist, Jay Michaelson, resorted to misuse of Scripture to defend the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) from the budget axe. Michaelson quoted chapter 35 of Exodus, a passage that records the time when God told the Israelites to give up their precious metals, jewels, fabrics, and spices for the construction of the Tabernacle. Michaelson’s lesson from this passage was, “Public art projects like the Tabernacle of the Israelites” is a good example of why taxpayers should fund the NEA.

Perhaps citing a 19th century French philosopher Frederic Bastiat will put all this into perspective. Bastiat was a Christian and a staunch opponent of socialism. Writing in his book *The Law*, he stated that some say, “There are persons who have no money,” and they therefore turn to the law. “But the law is not a breast that fills itself with milk. Nor are the lacteal veins of the law supplied with milk from a source outside the society. Nothing can enter the public treasury for the benefit of one citizen or one class unless other citizens and other classes have been *forced* to send it in ... When the law does this, it is an instrument of plunder.” (Emphasis added.)

In his letter to the church in Ephesus, the Apostle Paul said, “Let him who steals, steal no more.” He did not add, “unless you are going to give it to someone else.” But then again, this is not a verse a progressive activist is likely to quote.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.