What Makes Something Right or Wrong?

(September 7, 2019)

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to ask you to pray about something this week if you would. This Thursday, this Thursday evening, September 12, I will be with my friend Dr. Rice Broocks, the author of *God's Not Dead*. We're going to be on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and we are going to do a presentation called, "If God, Why Evil?" The reason we need special prayer for this event is because, just this past April on that campus, there was a school shooting. Two students died. One student died actually taking down the shooter.

We are going to go to that campus and hopefully minister to the students and deal with this very sensitive topic at a sensitive time and a sensitive place. I know people are hurting. Give us the grace, pray that God would give us the grace and the wisdom to handle this presentation rightly because people want answers. But they might actually not just want answers, they may want comfort. That's why my friend Rice Broocks is joining me, because he is a pastor; he's been through much tragedy and ministered to people through tragedy. We're going to do a joint presentation, "If God, Why Evil?" this Thursday night, September 12, at UNC Charlotte. All the details are on our website. If you want to be a part of that, if you're in the Charlotte area, this happens to be in McKnight Hall on the campus from 7-9pm. Of course, we'll take questions as well. We will stream it. That's our plan anyway. It will be on Facebook and our YouTube channel and also our website, crossexamined.org, if you want to see it. But just pray for the students, pray for the people there, and pray for Rice and me that we'll be able to communicate clearly and with the Spirit. Thanks for your prayers there.

I want to mention that there's a lot more that's going to be happening here coming up this month. In fact, next weekend, not this weekend, but next weekend, I'll be at First Baptist Church Boaz, AL, and then that evening, September 15th, I'll be at First Baptist Church, Albertville, AL. The next night we're going to be at Snead State University- it's actually Snead State Community College in Boaz, AL. If you're anywhere in that area, I'd love to see you there.
The next week I'm going to be at the Heights Baptist Church in South Chesterfield, VA, both morning and evening. We're going to do an evening presentation and Q&A. That is September 22. September 23, we start a new series on TV that we'll be taping here in Charlotte. The details are on our website. If you want to be a part of that, that's a men's group you can attend.

The following week, September 29th, I'll be at Quail Lakes Baptist morning services in Stockton, CA. It's an hour south of Sacramento in Stockton, CA. I'll be there for three services in the morning and then a Sunday night service as well. The next night, the University of the Pacific. That's in Stockton, California. Interesting trivia about the University of the Pacific. That's where they filmed the Raiders of the Lost Ark classroom scenes, at the University of the Pacific. Remember when Harrison Ford went out the window trying to get away from the students because he was a popular archaeologist? That was filmed there. Anyway, we're going to do "I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist" there. That date is September 30th. The next night, October 1st, Fresno State in Fresno, California.

Then the following week, I just want to get this in your mind so if any of you are in Arizona, I'm going to be at Calvary Tucson services Saturday night, October 5th, all three services Sunday morning, October 6th, and then Monday, October 7th, University of Arizona. Okay, that should be enough. The week after that, of course the National College on Christian Apologetics in Charlotte, Calvary Church, ses.edu. You go there for that kind of information. I just want to give you guys an update as to what's going on. Thank you for praying. If you're at any of those locations, would love to see you. Tell your friends about it!

This topic. The topic we're going to we're going to talk about, at least initially today, and then we'll get to some of your questions is, what makes something right or wrong? I mean, is it just human opinion? Are values just subjective preferences? Or is there really an objective standard of rightness of goodness and justice beyond us? We're going to have that. We're going to have some important insights about your kids from a pastor today who wrote me. Then I'm going to try and get to some other questions. The ones that you've emailed to us today here at hello@crossexamined.org.

What makes something right or wrong? The reason I want to bring this up- we've talked about it of course before on this program - but I saw an article. It was on the Christian Post, Sunday,
September 1st, and here was the headline which got me thinking about this. “Democrats Pass Resolution Praising Religiously Unaffiliated Americans Deriding Religious Liberty”. Okay, and here’s what the story says: Democrats passed a resolution lauding religiously unaffiliated voters (ie. atheists or nones) and framing religious liberty as a threat to civil rights. The resolution, which passed unanimously at the Democratic National Committee’s summer meeting in San Francisco on August 24, was championed by the Secular Coalition of America, group representing atheists, agnostics and humanists on policy matters. Here’s what they said: "Religiously unaffiliated Americans overwhelmingly share the democrat, the Democratic Party's values for rational public policy based on sound science and universal humanistic values." Now, that's probably true that atheists probably lineup more with the Democrats, but the question is, what do they mean by “sound science and universal humanistic values”?

Let's deal with the first issue first. Science. Science does not give you morality. Morality doesn't come out of a test tube or an experiment. Morality is something you must bring to science. I mean, science doesn't tell you whether or not you should lie about the results of your experiment or your study. You must bring morality to science. In fact, the University of Minnesota study, about 10 years ago, found that one-third of scientists admitted to fudging data in order to get the results they wanted. Those are just the ones that admitted it! I mean, science is only as morally upright and is only as objective as the scientists are! You have to bring morality to the enterprise of science. Science doesn't give you morality. In fact, I had a debate with Michael Shermer on this you can watch on our YouTube channel a few years ago. "What Better Explains Morality: Science or God?" Of course, I took God. Shermer took science. You can watch the whole thing on our YouTube channel. You have to bring morality to science. I mean, science can help you discover what kind of stem cell treatment might help someone, but it can't tell you if it's ethical to use that treatment. I mean, if you have to kill human beings in order to get certain stem cells to help another human being, is that ethical? Science won't tell you that. You have to bring ethics or morality to the scientific enterprise. Science can tell you if there is a genetic human being in the womb. It will tell you that. I mean, if you're honest, if you're an honest scientist, you know that an unborn child in the womb is a genetic human being. But science can't tell you whether or not you should protect that human being. That comes from outside science. Science is built on philosophy, and it's built on morality. If you don't bring morality to science, you're not going to get good scientific results.
Science can tell you how to build a bomb, but it can't tell you whether or not you want to use it. So, for this group [Secular Coalition of America] to say that we want to base our policy decisions on “sound science,” presupposes that you've got sound science and it presupposes the morality that you're bringing to the scientific enterprise. We got a whole lot more on this. Don't go away.

You're listening to CrossExamined live, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* with Frank Turek. We changed the podcast in order to make sure people knew what this was about. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* with Frank Turek. Come back in just two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

Welcome to, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* with Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio network. The podcast is called, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. If you're listening to the old podcast, you got to come over to the new one, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. Thank you so much, friends, for putting good sound positive reviews up on the *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* podcast. It is moving up the rankings and that enables more people to see it, and, therefore, hear it. Thank you for doing that! Tell your friends about it. Put positive reviews up there and it'll help move this podcast up the ratings!

We’re talking about this democrat resolution to basically appeal to atheists and agnostics through science and universal humanistic values. We pointed out that science doesn't give you a morality. You have to bring morality to science. Universal humanistic values. You might ask the questions “What are humanistic, or universal humanistic values? In what are they grounded?” If they're grounded in humans, they're not universal. Because all you need to ask is which human gets to decide? Is it Mother Teresa or Hitler? Is it Donald Trump or Joe Biden? Is it Hillary Clinton or George W. Bush? Is it Barack Obama or Mitch McConnell? I mean, you just keep asking questions. No, it's not human beings that decide what is good and true and right. That's grounded in God's nature. This resolution, put up by the democrats says, “Well, they agree with Democratic Party values.” My question is, “What our democrat values?” For that matter, what our republican or libertarian values? What is the standard that each group appeals to? Do we, do they just appeal to themselves, like we just get to decide this kind of thing? Are they appealing to an objective standard beyond themselves?
There was a lady quoted in here from the Secular Coalition of America. Her name is Sarah Levin. Here's what she said. Again, this is an article written on the Christian Post, and the title is from September 1st. You can go look it up. "Democrats pass resolution praising religiously unaffiliated Americans deriding religious liberty" Here's what Sarah Levin says, "America was founded as a secular government charged with representing and protecting the freedoms of people of all face, and none", said Sarah Levin, Director of Governmental Affairs for the Secular Coalition of America. America was not founded on a secular government, Sarah. In fact, our founding document is, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men were created equal and endowed by their Creator.” Not their government. “Endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Governments are instituted among men to do what? To secure these rights. Governments don't give you rights. Governments don't take away your rights. Governments are instituted to secure rights. In fact, that's what political parties are supposed to do. Good political parties are supposed to secure the rights of Americans, of the citizens. Good governments are supposed to protect those rights. They're supposed to protect innocent people from evil. Paul talks about this in Romans chapter 13. That the Ruler has the sword for a reason. The sword being a description of government power. The ability to punish evil. They have that ability in order to protect innocent people from evil and to protect rights. You don't get your rights from government. If that were the case, they wouldn't be rights, they'd be preferences, because the next time a government comes in into power and decides to change the law, does that mean you don't you still don't have those rights? No. Rights are something government can't give you or can't take away from you-rights you have because you're a human being. If government tries to take away those rights, that's an illegitimate government. That's a tyrannical government.

By the way, this is the reason our country struggled for its independence, because the Declaration of Independence goes on to name a number of rights that King George the Third of England was violating. The rights of the colonists here. That's why they had this long list of abuses that George was committing. They said, “Look, we're going to kick you out of here, we're going to have our own government, because your government it's tyrannical, is taking these rights away from us.” So, if you don't appeal to something outside yourself, i.e. God, there's no such thing as rights. They're just preferences.
It’s true our country was not founded on Christianity. Let me agree with that. But it was founded on theism. The country was founded on theism. Most of the people that started our country, and most of the people in the country were Christians. But that was a description. It was not a prescription. They did not prescribe Christianity from the federal government. By the way, they did in the state governments. Did you know that many state governments required you to be a Christian to be in government? Many state governments said you had to believe in Jesus Christ and the resurrection. I mean, these were in state constitutions. The federal government didn't want to have any religious tests. But the state governments allowed religious tests. In fact, five of the 13 states - colonies then they became states- had state religions when they signed the Bill of Rights in 1791. In fact, the last state to get rid of their state church was Massachusetts in 1833. They had state churches, so they knew they could have state churches, they just couldn't have a federal church, a national church. But that's beside the point; no extra charge for that.

Our government was founded on theism -that there's a God out there who grounds rights, and governments are instituted to protect these rights. You didn't have to be a Christian to be an American. You could be an atheist and be an American, but our country was founded on the idea that rights are grounded in God.

Now, the resolution went on to criticize Americans, and it refers to religious freedom claims as discriminatory. Here's what it says. Again, this is a real resolution passed by the Democratic Party, the DNC, the Democratic National Committee, in San Francisco, on August 24th. Here's what they said, "Those most loudly claiming that morals, values, and patriotism must be defined by their particular religious views, have used those religious views with misplaced claims of "religious liberty" to justify public policy that has threatened the civil rights and liberties of many Americans, including, but not limited to, the LGBTQ community, women, and ethnic and religious minorities.” Now notice what they’ve said here. They just contradicted what they said earlier. Well, what Sarah Levin said earlier. She said that the government was “charged with representing and protecting the freedoms of people of all faiths and none.” Yet here the resolution [actually] says “There's a particular group that we are going to get behind and another group that we’re going to say, you don't have rights.” They just said, this is about the religious freedoms or the freedoms of all faiths or none.
Well, what happens when faiths conflict? What happens when religious rights and so-called LGBT rights conflict? The DNC is saying that the religious people have no rights, when LGBTQ rights conflict. Look, there's no middle ground between, “You must celebrate my same sex wedding!” and “My conscience or my religion tells me I can't” There's no middle ground. One side is going to have to give way. What the DNC is saying is, unfortunately, religious people are going to have to give way to LGBTQ people when it comes to these rights, because these are now conflicting rights.

It's interesting. My friend Michael Brown, we had on the program a couple of weeks ago, just wrote a column, which I tweeted out, Why Does Separation of Church and State Only Go One Way? In there, he points out when Ted Cruz may quote a Bible verse or something he's a “dominion theologian” who's trying to impose his religion on people. It's the separation of church and state! Ted, you can't do that. But when Mayor Pete, a Democratic candidate, who happens to be a homosexual, quotes the Bible, which he does frequently to support some sort of public policy position, “Oh, he's just wise.” I mean, why is it that when leftists quote the Bible, it's okay, but when people on the right quote the Bible, “Oh, no, you can't do that!”

Actually, the real issue here is not the separation of church and state. We could talk all day about that. The separation of church and state is not in the Constitution. The First Amendment says, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” It doesn't say anything about separation of church and state. That was a Supreme Court decision that inserted a letter that Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptists in 1803. They inserted into their dicta, which is the Court’s opinion, and, from that point on, people erroneously think the separation of church and state is in the Constitution. It's not. But even if it was in the Constitution, the topic is irrelevant. Why? Because we're not trying to legislate a religion. At least people on the right aren't trying to say “You have to be a part of a particular church. You have to get involved in certain rites and rituals. You have to be a particular denomination.” No, nobody is saying that on the right- or very few or anyway. Nobody's saying they have to be a part of a religion. But what we are saying is that you have to treat people in a certain way.

In other words, we're not trying to legislate religion. We are trying to legislate morality. Everybody's trying to do that! Everybody's trying to legislate a moral position. The DNC is
legislating a moral position when they say that LGBTQ rights, whatever they are, must take precedence over anybody else's rights. That's a moral position. They're saying LGBTQ concerns are more important than say, Mother Teresa's concerns, or Billy Graham's concerns, or any Christian's concerns, or any Muslim's concerns, that LGBTQ morality must be imposed over Christian, or Muslim, or any other morality. Those are all moral positions. You can't avoid legislating morality. The only question is, whose morality?

In fact, I spoke to a group of pastors this Thursday here in Charlotte. We got talking about this issue. I said what I normally say, if people bring up the separation of church and state, “First of all, it's not the issue. The issue is not religion, its morality.” When people say, “Don't impose your morality on me!” I always say this: “Why not? Would that be immoral? You see, because you're imposing your morality on me right now. You're saying I ought not impose ought nots, but you're imposing the ought not on me that I ought not impose ought nots.” I know that will give you intellectual constipation if you play that again, but you get the idea. It's a self-defeating proposition. Everybody's trying to impose a moral point of view. But I'm not trying to impose my moral point of view. In fact, it's not just my moral point of view. Here's what I typically say when people say, “Don't impose your morality.” I say, “This isn't my morality. I didn't make this stuff up. I didn't make up the fact that murder's wrong, that rape is wrong, that death is wrong, that abortion is wrong, that men were made for women and women were made for men, and the best way to perpetuate and stabilize society, which is the reason the government's involved in marriage to begin with, which is to legally recognize the man woman relationship over every other relationship. I didn't make any of that stuff up. This isn't my morality. This isn't your morality. This is THE morality, the one Thomas Jefferson said was “self-evident.” The one the Apostle Paul, in Romans chapter two said, “the Gentiles have the law written on their hearts.” So, it's not my morality. I'm not trying to impose my morality; I'm trying to impose the morality. And if you have a problem with that, you don't have a problem with me, you have a problem with the creator on whose nature this is derived from. We hold these truths to be self-evident.”

All right, we got more on this. Don't go away. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with Frank Turek. Our website crossexamined.org. That's crossexamined with a D on the end of it .org. We're back in two.
Why I Still Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, our most popular online course, starts this coming week, if you want to be a part of it. I don't even know if we have any more room. We were down to just two or three seats last I checked. But check it out if you want to be a part of it. If there's any room, you can join us for the Premium version. We're doing eight different zoom sessions during this, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, Why I Still Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist online course. In other words, I'm live with you on Zoom Video. We can see one another. It's an online classroom, we do Q&A, we learn from one another. That's the Premium version. If you want to take the if you want to take the Basic version, that's self-paced. You can take it whenever you want. And that's up there, as well. Just go to crossexamined.org. and click on “online courses.” You'll see that there. We got a bunch of other courses coming up here soon, but we'll tell you more about that later.

Let's go back to the topic we're talking about. We were talking about how the DNC came out with a statement that's trying to basically say that atheistic values are humanistic values, universal values. How they can be universal, if there's no God, is a mystery to me. It's just one person's opinion against another person's opinion. They were saying that their morality, that they're trying to impose, supersedes the Christian morality, or the natural law morality, upon which the country was founded. So, look, every political party, everyone in public life, is trying to impose some sort of moral position. The only question is, whose moral position? I want to impose the right moral position. Not my moral position, but God's moral position. The natural law moral position. That's not legislating religion. That's legislating morality. If you're going to say, “Look, we can't legislate something, because it's in the Bible.” Think about that. That's ridiculous, because if that were the case, you couldn't have laws against murder. You couldn't have laws against theft. Because it's in the Bible. No, we're not legislating it because it's in the Bible. We're legislating it because it's consistent with laws in the Bible. Why? Because the natural law, the law that Jefferson appealed to, “nature's law,” he called it. The law that the Apostle Paul appeals to in Romans chapter two. That law comes from the same source- God of the Bible.

The principles are going to be consistent, but you don't need to impose the Bible in order to have a moral society. You just impose the moral law consistent with the Bible, which is what our country was founded upon. Now, you can go to the Bible for clarification, obviously, but you're not legislating a religion when you're putting moral laws into place. You're not telling
people they have to be a part of religion. We're telling people, they have to treat other people certain ways. That's what all laws are trying to do. That's what every political party's trying to do. So, don't buy into this idea, don't shutter because “Oh, I've gotta defend a moral position and since I'm a Christian I can't do that because that's a violation...” No. It's not church and state. Nothing at all to do with church and state. It's legislating morality and everybody's trying to do that. You might want to ask somebody else, “Well, what's your standard of morality? Where you getting these precepts from? Where do you think that a person has a right to force another person to participate in his or her same sex wedding? Where does that morality come from? That's what you're saying, right?”

Alright, I got a question from Norway. He says, “Hi, I'm Rune from Norway, a highly atheistic country, whereas I am a Christian. Before asking my question, I want to thank CrossExamined and Dr. Frank Turek for everything you do. I want to give you and RZIM (Ravi Zacharias) the credit for becoming a Christian.” Well, we may have helped a little bit but that thanks, Rune, the Holy Spirit helped, as well, and you were willing to be open to that.

He says this, “I'm still only 14 years old.” Wow, there is hope for Norway, just like there's hope for America! “I'm still only 14 years old so it is great to talk or to walk with God from such an early age of life, early stage of life, and for the rest of my life and forevermore. Thank you. Moving forward to my question: Does the moral argument point to the Christian God, let alone a monotheistic God? Or does it just point to a god whereas it could also point to a pantheistic God?”

Well, thanks. Great question, Rune. No, the moral argument can't point to a pantheistic or impersonal God. Why? Because the being that issues commands must be personal in order to issue a command that's consistent with his nature. All right? Laws come from law givers. Impersonal forces don't have a mind to issue commands, nor do they know when these commands are violated. So, an impersonal force can't be just, because in order to achieve justice, the force would have to have an intellect to know who has been unjust, and then have the power to take action to actually achieve justice to right wrong. So, the force can't be impersonal. You can't have an impersonal force being the standard of rightness and wrongness. The force has to be personal; it has to be knowledgeable. Sounds like God, right? Of course.
The being that is just is a personal being with power and knowledge; you can actually do justice, achieve justice. I mean, it would be odd to say that the source of justice isn't just, wouldn't it? Of course, the source of justice must be just, but in order to be just you have to have the power to right wrongs. You have to know what wrongs have been done in order to right them. You also have to have a mind to know all this. So, at a minimum, you've got a being that looks like a theistic being. You have a being whose nature is right and just and is knowledgeable and has the power to right wrong. It can't be a pantheistic force. It's got to be a theistic God.

Now which theistic God? Well, the moral argument alone doesn't take you all the way to Christianity. It could just be a generic, theistic god. It could be just a god of the Old Testament, which as we know for Christians, that the God of the Old Testament is the same as the God of the New Testament. But if you're Jewish, and you say, “Well, I don't believe Jesus rose from the dead, so I don't, I don't trust in the New Testament.” I mean, if Jesus didn't rise from the dead, then we've got an issue here that maybe it's just the God of Judaism. Or maybe it's another god. It can't be Allah. Why can't it be Allah? Because by Muslim theologians own admission, Allah is arbitrary. Whatever Allah does is good. Allah doesn't do it because it's good, because it's nature's good. Whatever Allah does is good.

Now, this, I think, is also an implication of hard five-point Calvinism, unfortunately. Because in hard five-point Calvinism, it turns out that God is infinitely just but not infinitely loving. You actually have a God who is, to a certain extent arbitrary, because He elects some to be saved against their will. They don't have free will. Whereas I believe the proper Christian view of God is God, yes, when He elects, He knows who's going to be saved and who isn't saved, but He doesn't elect against people's free will. People still have their free will to accept or reject Him. Look, if God exists, and He does, it's unavoidable when He creates a universe, He knows how it's going to turn out. Why? Because He's all knowing. So, no matter what universe He creates, He knows how it's going to turn out. But that doesn't mean that He's electing the universe to turn out against the free will of the creatures in the universe. Just because you know something's going to happen doesn't mean you're causing it. Just like when you have children yourself, you know at some point your kids are going to sin, but that doesn't mean you're causing them to sin. You just know they're going to sin. Don't think, necessarily, that five-point
Calvinists all understand this implication. But, I think if you draw it out, the implication is God turns out to be arbitrary, rather than essentially loving, essentially just, essentially righteous.

Back to Rune's question, the moral argument shows the theistic God, but it doesn't get all the way to Christianity. Why? Because you have to see if Jesus was who He said He was, in order to know if Christianity is true. Now if Jesus turns out to be who He said He was, God incarnate, before Abraham was born, I am, He's the God of the Old Testament in human form. If He turns out to be that God, then the God of morality is the God of Christianity. Or the God who is the ground of morality is the God of Christianity. But you need more than just the moral argument to get there. You also need to see who Jesus was.

You see, no argument gets you all the way to Christianity. You got to build them like you build the foundation to a building. You know? You start with truth, as we do in, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. You move on to God. Does God exist? You talk about are miracles possible? Then you look at the New Testament. Is it really true that Jesus rose from the dead? Then if Jesus rose from the dead, everything else falls like dominoes from there, or builds up all the way to the top of the skyscraper, to stay with the metaphor here. If Jesus truly was God, then the same being that walked out of the tomb in His human nature 1,986 years ago, is the same God in whose divine nature created the universe out of nothing and is the ground of all being, including morality. But no argument gets you all the way there. You got to build them up. But great question, Rune, and thanks for your kind comments.

Now, I've got this a letter from an email from a pastor in Boston, whom I've talked to on the phone before, that I want to read some of this to you because it's very instructive. He wanted me to write a book on biblical love because so many people confuse what love is. They think love is approval and love is approving whatever you want somebody else to do. Unfortunately right now, I don't have time to write a book on biblical love because I've got other things going on, but his point is well taken that people misunderstand what love is. They think love is approval and love is approving whatever you want somebody else to do. Unfortunately right now, I don't have time to write a book on biblical love because I've got other things going on, but his point is well taken that people misunderstand what love is. Here's what he writes to me; I asked him if I could share this. I'll withhold his name, but he's a big pastor up in the northeast. He says, "Most of what's out there regarding biblical love is awful and unbiblical. They are a constant regurgitation of pop psychology and self-esteem drivel. I'm sure you've seen what's out there, and after just reading the titles of some of them, it's no wonder we're in the trouble we are in." He says, "Most are an appeal to feelings and the oversensitivity of the
me centered culture brought into the church. Since love is so central to Christianity it is really affecting all areas of Christian living today”.

Yeah, basically, if you don't have the right definition of love, if love is approval, then in order to love say, let's just use the LGBTQ example, in order to love people, you have to approve of what they do. That’s what people are misunderstanding love to be. But we all know love isn't that. I mean if you really think about it. If you're a parent and you just approve of everything your child wants to do, you're not loving. You have to stand in the way of evil. Paul says, “Love always protects.” How do you protect? You stand in the way of evil.

All right back to this pastor. He says, "I've been a pastor for 30 years. And it's not just the increase in divorces that are troublesome. But the reason for them is even a greater problem. I've had couples in my office that have found others and are willing to get divorced because they "married the wrong people the first time" or after a short courtship, where they don't know each other well enough to marry, they run out and get married to find out they made a grave error and then they want to erase it all as a mistake. I could go on and on with the multitude of reasons. But the foundational problem is a lack of Bible knowledge, coupled with the fact, a lack of willingness to do things according to the Scriptures. Unfortunately, by the time they reach my office, educating them on the Bible falls on deaf ears and they just want what they want. Lust of the flesh after the lust of the eyes has taken over.” He goes on to say, "The cultural pressures are much different than when we grew up, although I didn't grow up as a Christian.” He says, "I teach high school Bible classes at our school.” He says, "In one of my classes the kids were telling me that in sixth grade in public schools around here that kids are all having sex with each other. Additionally, many are on drugs and are so familiar with drinking that they know the hard liquor of their choice.” He goes on to say, "I didn't even know what sex was in the sixth grade.”

Okay, we got more of this right after the break. More cheery news from the public schools, ladies and gentlemen. By the way, this happens in private schools, as well. Parents, you need to be armed you, need to have knowledge, you need to do something. We'll tell you how to do that right after the break. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with Frank Turek. Back in two.
Alright, friends, Frank Turek with you on, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. I was reading from a letter that a pastor in the northeast wrote me. I want to finish up what he said. By the way, this is in response to last week's radio program podcast called, *Sex and Your Commanding Officer*. If you haven't listened to that, please go back and listen to that. Hopefully, it will be helpful. The pastor said, "There was a teacher in class doing work while I was teaching, and she had previously been a public school teacher. She corroborated the kids and said that she had two sixth grade kids when she was a public school teacher that were pregnant. This is the environment that Christian kids are rubbing shoulders with and many parents are really unaware of how bad it is. They think it's just like it was when they grew up. No, it's not friends. When you try and tell them they think you're overstating the case, you're overstating the issue to provide shocked to get a response. But it's not. This stuff is actually going on out there. And many Christian kids are entirely unarmed in this battle."

Friends, you need to talk to your kids about all the taboo issues you don't want to talk to them about. In fact, my wife and I, we talked to our kids about sex very early on. Why? And, look, we want them to come to us with these questions when they have them. We don't want them going to their friends or other people. We want them to always be free to talk to us about any issue at any time. If you get all uptight and freak out when you know when these issues come up, or your kids bring them up, do you think they're going to come to you about it? No. Talk about it in a casual way. Just say this is the truth. Let me tell you how this works. Okay? And how sex is not just physical. Sex is...just go back and listen to last week's podcast. I'm not going to go into that whole thing about how sex is not just physical. We know it's not just physical, but the culture treats it like it is. Go back and listen to, *Sex and Your Commanding Officer*. Teach your kids the dangers and the truth and also the beauty of sex. It's something that has to be put in the right place in order for it to be something that will bring you closer to God and something will bring your closer to others. As I've said before, sex is like fire. If you put it in your fireplace it's wonderful. You get it anywhere else in your house it'll burn your house down.

All right, I got this email from Carolyn, who emailed me yesterday after the *Sex and Your Commanding Officer* program. She said, "Yesterday, while I was driving around doing errands, I listened the second half of your CrossExamined radio program on 88.1 AFR in Richmond, Virginia. I was so glad to hear you speaking the truth on sexual sin and how wrong it is. I completely agreed with everything you were saying I really appreciate you being as bold and
speaking like this. Thank you. You said that people would probably be upset and email your hateful things. I wanted to email you to encourage you in your ministry."

You know, thank you for the encouragement, Carolyn, and others who encourage our ministry. Everybody needs encouragement. In fact, I even heard Rush Limbaugh talking about this the other day. He goes “I even need encouragement”. Everyone needs encouragement, right, to do what's right. Because you get a lot of people trying to run you down. Thanks for the encouragement!

She says, “There are lots of Christians who agree with you and we who agree are thankful for Christian teachers and leaders like you who speak the truth. May God richly bless you.” Now, here's what she said about her personal situation. Check this out, ladies and gentlemen. Here's what she said, "I went through a divorce years ago, due to some verbal and emotional abuse that was turning physical. After the initial separation, I was searching the scriptures. God led me to First Corinthians seven, verses 10 and 11. This is what they say: “To the married, I give this charge, not I but the Lord, says Paul. The wife should not separate from her husband, but if she does, she should remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband.” Here's what Carolyn says, "So based on that scripture, and understanding, this was the Lord's will for my life. I chose to not even entertain the thought of dating or marriage. Reconciliation didn't work out. At the times of the greatest temptation God has been faithful in keeping me faithful to this commitment, as I press into the Word, and the fellowship of believers, lifting up prayers and singing praises to the Lord. I just thought you might be encouraged that there are people like me in the world today. I'm also so glad to hear your show yesterday. Again, thank you."

All I can say is wow, Carolyn. In today's culture, which falsely teaches that you cannot be complete without a partner, your drive to obey Jesus, your Commanding Officer (go back to the last week's podcast to see what I'm talking about,) to them, to the culture, it seems like a Herculean effort. They think you're crazy, Carolyn! They can’t imagine going without sex or a a partner. You’re actually going against the culture's sex religion, or the religion of sex. That's the new religion in America, religion of sex. Some of them may consider you a heretic, Carolyn.

But look, let's take the emotion out of it and let's just think about this logically for a minute. We all know that people can live life well. In fact, sometimes even better, without getting married.
In fact, Paul puts it this way later in chapter seven of First Corinthians, beginning in verse 32. Here’s what he says: “I would like you to be free from concern. An unmarried man is concerned about the Lord’s affairs, how he can please the Lord. But a married man is concerned about the affairs of this world, how we please his wife, and his interests are divided. An unmarried woman or virgin is concerned about the Lord’s affairs. Her aim is to be devoted to the Lord in both body and spirit. But a married woman is concerned about the affairs of this world, how she can please her husband. I’m saying this for your own good, not to restrict you, but that you may live in a right way in undivided devotion to the Lord.” He later goes on to say if you want to get married, you can. He’s just saying that when you’re married, your interests might be divided.

Sam Albury, who is a same-sex attracted, apologist writer, who actually works with Ravi Zacharias (RZIM), has this short little video when he’s speaking to his denomination, which was flirting with the idea of approving that the behaviors of homosexuality were approved by the Lord. Sam Albury is same-sex attracted, but he’s celibate. He got up in this little video and said, "My Lord was celibate. Was He less of a person because He was celibate?" I mean, think about that. Was He? Of course not. The Lord Himself was celibate. There are advantages to singleness. You might not be called to marriage. If you’re single, you’re not less of a person than somebody who’s married. In fact, I remember Alistair Begg, the great preacher, at one point he knew of a guy in Ireland, or Scotland where Alistair’s from. The guy was a Christian into his 80s. You know, he died when he was in his 80s. Like John Stott. John Stott was a Christian, never got married. Christian theologian, apologist. Anyway, Alistair asked his friend, John, “John, why did you never get married?” His friend said, “I’d rather want what I do not have than have what I do not want.”

He didn’t want to marry just for the sake of getting married and then regret that he had gotten married. Was he less of a person? No. Now, ladies and gentlemen, this doesn’t mean that marriage wouldn’t be beneficial in ministry. I mean, being married can help you minister to others, in some cases. In fact, if you get the right help mate, you might be able to do more for the Lord. That’s certainly been my experience. My wife, and even my sons, to some extent, have helped me in ministry in immeasurable ways. I couldn't do what I'm doing without my wife, Stephanie. Wouldn't be able to do it. But there are other people that they could do
ministry without being married. Paul was saying, if that's you, and you want to devote all your attention to the Lord, hallelujah. Hallelujah. Go ahead and do that.

So, Carolyn, thank you for sending us that description of what you've been doing, and alerting us to it. We'll pray that you can continue along the way to devote yourself completely to the Lord. So, thanks for letting me know you're out there and our listeners, letting us know that you're out there. Because it goes completely against what the culture says. But the culture as you well know, ladies and gentlemen, is frequently wrong. The question is, who is your Commanding Officer? Who is your standard? Is your standard the culture or is it Jesus? Too many Christians are making the culture the standard, rather than Jesus.

All right let me squeeze one more question in here. "Hello, Dr. Turek. I'm a new listener to your podcast and I want you to know, I think it's fantastic.” Well, thank you. This guy's name is Chris. He happens to be an attorney in New York. He says, "I just bought, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, and love it. Quick question for you. Have you ever done a podcast or written something about the authenticity of the Bible? Specifically, I'm interested in what you have to say about the author of the Pentateuch, the first five books of the Bible. I have been taught it was Moses, but I'm also aware of secularists who claim it was authored by four different people. Just looking for some good arguments I can use. Thanks, Chris.”

Chris, thank you for your question. There is an article that I saw on Josh McDowell's ministry, josh.org, about this. It's called, Moses, Author of the Pentateuch. In fact, let me, because I only have a minute left, I'm not gonna be able to cover it in any detail. Did Moses author the Pentateuch? is the question. The article points out in several places that Moses is said to have written things down. For example, in Exodus 17, the Lord said to Moses, “Write this as a memorial in the book and recite it in the ears of Joshua.” In Exodus 24 it says, “And Moses wrote down all the words of the Lord.” Exodus 34 says the same thing. Numbers 33, Deuteronomy 31, same thing. Jesus actually says, in John 5:46, he says, “For if you believed Moses, you would believe me, for Moses wrote of me.” There are several other places in the New Testament that seem to indicate that Moses wrote.

Now you can get the article to go into more detail. But let make this point. The key point is not necessarily the authorship, because even conservative scholars agree that there has been some
editing or updating to the Pentateuch during Israel's history, which certainly could have been inspired by God. The key point is the truthfulness of the Pentateuch. Jesus and the apostles spoke as if it were true. So, because Jesus rose from the dead, I'm going to believe what He says, not what some speculative liberal scholar says about who wrote the Pentateuch. Whoever wrote it, it's true, and it seems like Moses did write much of it.

All right. I'm Frank Turek, friends. Great being with you. Don't forget a lot coming up next week. Pray for the September 12th, "If God, Why Evil?" event at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. And then next week I'll be in Alabama. Check our website for more. crossexamined.org See you next time. God bless.