

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Does the moral argument, ladies and gentlemen, depend on everyone agreeing on right and wrong? I got an email from a retired attorney that suggested that, and in fact, he suggested many other questions that are going to take us through this program. Another question, can human beings construct an objective moral standard independent of God? Are God's commands based on God's desires? Are they based on God's authority? Or something else? And can't evolution explain morality? Do changing views on morality mean there is no objective morality because our morals change generation to generation in some areas? And what about moral dilemmas? Do they show that morality is relative? And there are many other questions that were posed by a letter this attorney wrote me, an email he wrote me. We're going to get to it a little bit later in the program.

But before we get to those questions, we have to at least say something about what happened last week politically with regard to Beto O'Rourke, who is a democrat candidate for President. I don't know where Beto comes from. I don't know why that Beto where it comes from, but I think his name is Robert Francis O'Rourke, something like that. He's obviously, it appears anyway, Irish and for some reason, maybe has Hispanic blood on his mother's side, I don't know. But some people think he's Hispanic, whatever. But anyway, he came out on CNN last week, or earlier this week, saying that churches who are not toeing the line, who will not agree to same sex marriage, can no longer be considered tax exempt if he's the president. In fact, many people wrote about this. Ben Shapiro wrote about it at Fox News over at stream. Tom Gilson wrote about it. Here's what Shapiro said, "failing Democratic presidential candidate Beto O'Rourke", by the way he's saying he's failing because I think he's less than 5% in the polls, "is raging against the dying of his political light. Desperate and alone his campaign is on the precipice of collapse. Beto has banked on one policy, radical honesty, and that means he's now saying the quiet part of the progressive agenda out loud. This is a candidate who openly claims he'll come take America's guns, although he then pretends this won't involve the police acting as an enforcement arm and removing those weapons. This is a candidate who suggests that abortion one day before full term is a constitutional right. And now", by the way, I'm reading from Ben Shapiro's column. "And now this is a candidate who admits that he will seek to bankrupt virtually every traditional religious institution in America. When asked at a CNN democratic Town Hall regarding LGBTQ issues, about whether nonprofit status should be removed from churches that refuse to honor same sex marriages, O'Rourke simply said yes. And he then went on to explain this". Here's what he said. "There can be no reward, no benefit,

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

no tax break for anyone or any institution, any organization in America that denies the full human rights and the full civil rights of every single one of us. So, as President, we are going to make that a priority and we are going to stop those who are infringing upon the rights of our fellow Americans".

Shapiro goes on to say, "this statement is insanely radical. It suggests that the mere presence of religious institutions that dissent from the left's political orthodoxy, the social left's political orthodoxy cannot be tolerated. It is not an infringement on rights for free associations of religious people to deny the validity of marriages based both on historic natural law and traditionally religious precepts. But according to O'Rourke, the existence of such institutions amounts to an infringement". Shapiro goes on to say, "this move by O'Rourke was utterly foreseeable". In fact, I've been talking about this for years, and I think Shapiro has too. In fact, here's what Shapiro says. "In expectation of precisely this sort of logic, I endorsed the libertarian position on same sex marriage, get government out of the entire business of marriage, in March 2013, two years before the Supreme Court case".

Now, let me stop right here. I agree with almost everything Ben Shapiro says. I don't agree with this. Why? Here's why. Why does the government need to be involved in marriage? Let me ask you this, ladies and gentlemen. If a husband decides he's going to leave his wife and six kids and not give them any support, he's going to run off with his secretary or something, do you think the church, or the synagogue can enforce him to pay child support and alimony? No. The church and the synagogue can't do that. Only the government has the power to force that man to pay for his dependents. And so, the government has to be involved in marriage to protect women and children. So, as nice as it sounds to say, well, let's just get the government out of marriage and that way we won't have these conflicts, it doesn't work in practicality because only the government can really enforce people to live up to their commitments.

Anyway, here's what Shapiro says. "I wrote, at the time that any federal crackdown of same sex marriage would result in states being forced to recognize same sex marriages, public schools being forced to teach its morality, and religious institutions losing tax exempt status. Religious Americans, I predicted", this is Shapiro speaking, "will be forced into violating their beliefs or facing legal consequences by the government. The first amendment guarantee of religious liberty will largely become obsolete. At the time this was considered over the top. Now it's a

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

mainstream democratic position". And the column goes on. You can read about it. Just search for Ben Shapiro.

Beto O'Rourke wants to bankrupt virtually every traditional religious institution in America. This was dated, what was a dated, let me see...the 17th of October. Anyway, yeah. Now, this is what is going on. Now, the First Amendment protects freedom of speech, obviously, freedom of association, freedom of religion. These things are protected by the First Amendment. Now to say that the government is going to force a religious institution to do what it wants to do is a violation of that first amendment. In fact, the oft quoted separation of church and state, you know is not in the Constitution. It's in a letter that Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptists because the Danbury Baptists were worried that the government was going to infringe on the church, not that the church was going to infringe on the government. The founders wanted the church to be the moral conscience of the government. They wanted religious people to [unintelligible]. What they didn't want was the government to influence religion, or to influence churches. That's why he used the phrase, the separation of church and state. It was a one-way wall that prevented the government from interfering in the church, precisely what Beto O'Rourke wants to do. He wants to tell churches, at the threat basically of bankruptcy, that if you don't agree with us, we are going to hurt you. You say, well, nobody, nobody is guaranteed the right to tax exempt status. I'm going to explain why churches have tax exempt status right here after the break.

But the point here is that Beto O'Rourke wants to it wants to use government power to infringe on religious belief and religious practice. That is a clear violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. And this is why some other Democratic candidates, who are little wiser than him said no, we can't go there. But it'll be interesting to see if other Democratic candidates line up with what O'Rourke says. A couple of them have said, no they don't, but who knows if they ever become president, they might actually do that. Because look, the religion of sex, as I've been saying for years, is a religion of the sword. In other words, if you don't agree with what they want to do, they are going to hurt you. I mean, what was it 10 years ago? Oh, we just want religious, we just want marriage equality. Now 10 years later, if you don't adhere to what we believe, if you don't attend our same sex wedding as a florist, or as a photographer, or as a caterer, if you don't do what we want you to do, we will hurt you. This is not live and let live friends. This is, you see it our way or we will hurt you. You don't care about this? You will be

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

made to care, ladies and gentlemen. That's what's going on. Now, why are churches and other institution tax exempt? Why is that? We're going to talk about it right after the break and then later in the program get into those moral questions. In fact, this is going to be a two parter. We'll continue this next week.

I'm Frank Turek and you're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, on the AFR talk radio network. Back in two.

Welcome back to CrossExamined. Well, actually, we're now calling this podcast, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, because it says more. And if you've noticed that the CrossExamined feed on iTunes is no longer being updated, if you want this podcast, you have to get the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist feed. Or you can just get the CrossExamined app. Two words in the App Store. Cross Examined. It has all the podcasts on it. And in fact, it even goes back way before the iTunes feed goes back. It has shows on there that are 2, 3, 4, or 5 years old. And look, most of the shows we do are evergreen. Right now, we're talking about a current event. We don't do that quite a bit. Normally, we're talking about evergreen topics. Actually, this is an evergreen topic, the First Amendment, but we're discussing it in the context of a current event. But you can go back and listen to shows that are five years old and they're still evergreen because most of the time we're talking about evidence for Christianity or attacks against Christianity, and how to cross examine them and refute them. So, get our app, the CrossExamined app. There's a lot on there. There's also a quick answer section, the TV show is streamed there, our calendar's up there. You can watch when we stream events.

In fact, we're going to be up at the University of Alaska at Anchorage, Monday night, this Monday night, two days from now. What is that? October 21? Let's see...October 21, Monday night. Now it's going to be late if you live on the East Coast, because I think we're starting at 6:30pm Anchorage time, which would be like 10:30pm Eastern time. And of course, the Q&A will probably start around like midnight Eastern time, but if you're an insomniac, you can watch it. Or you can go to our YouTube channel, you can go to our Facebook page, you can go to our website, and the stream will be up there when you wake up in the morning. So, if you want to see any of that you can.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now we're talking about tax exempt status. Why are churches and other charities tax exempt? Perhaps the biggest reason they are tax exempt is because they serve the community more effectively, and more personally, than any government program ever could. Let me just give you a list, and this is not an exhaustive list, a list of benefits that churches and other religious institutions actually bring to civilization, other than salvation and discipleship. Right? What is the purpose of church according to Ephesians 4? To equip the saints to do ministry. Equip the saints to do ministry. And when the saints do ministry. Who are the saints? Those are people that go to church. Those are Christians. When the saints do ministry, we get a lower crime rate, a lower suicide rate, less abuse, less abortion, less homelessness, less loneliness, because people are in community in church. Less hunger. We alleviate the problems for the poor. These are all things that churches, and other religious institutions, can do better than the government can. So, by foregoing the government, or by the government foregoing taxing churches, they get a much greater benefit than if they taxed churches and tried to use that money themselves to alleviate these problems. They couldn't alleviate these problems like the church can.

What else do churches do? Well, they provide mental health counseling. They provide substance abuse help. They provide health care, education, assistance for military families, pregnancy care, adoption and orphan care, HIV/AIDS care, pornography addiction services, personal and family counseling, community sports leagues, single parent help. In fact, there's a church I was at not long ago, they had auto care for single moms and widows. You know, all the mechanically inclined men would come to church, and if you're a single mom or a widow and you had a problem with your car, bring it there that day and they'll see about fixing it. Clothes closets, weddings and funerals, seminars that strengthen marriages, help for persons with disabilities, meals and food services for the poor, mentorship for students. These are all things that churches do, ladies and gentlemen. The government can't do all these things, and they can't do it as efficiently as churches can. Employment workshops, premarital counseling, fitness programs, homeless care, housing, personal coaching and personal training for the homeless and persons in recovery, camps for inner city and other needy youth, disaster relief. How many people are right now over in the Bahamas helping disaster relief? Churches and parachurch organizations are doing that. Tax money can't do it as effectively as ministries and churches can.

When you give your money to a church, or Samaritan's Purse, or some organization that goes and helps people like that, that money gets right to the affected people. This is why the

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

government says, look, it's much more efficient, and it's much better for our civilization, to give churches and other organizations tax exempt status. Churches, they also lead community cleanup initiatives, they give legal aid, they help alleviate or help prevent sexually trafficked women and children. they have literacy programs, they have prison ministries and reentry into society, they care for seniors, they have drama, art, music, events. These are all things that churches provide and it's a great reason why government says look, we're not going to tax you because you do so much good that we can't do. It's much more efficient for you to do it. It's a good thing, also to provide religious and moral instruction. That's the reason, or some of the reasons that churches and other religious institutions and educational institutions get tax exemptions.

In fact, did you know that most private and public universities are tax exempt, as well? Now, most of those are leftist organizations, but they're tax exempt as well, because the government decided that they want to encourage education. As politically charged as some of these universities are, most of them are, the government still says, oh yeah, it's okay, we're not going to tax you for the common good. And yet Beto O'Rourke thinks, because the church doesn't want to recognize or participate in a same sex marriage, that he's going to stop all those positive effects done by churches. In fact, I'm not just talking about conservative churches. A lot of liberal churches do these things, too. And Beto O'Rourke thinks that it's a good idea to stop all these positive outcomes because they have a doctrinal opposition to same sex marriage? Are you kidding me? You shouldn't get anywhere near the White House, friend. It's crazy. Its just political correctness run amok. That's all it is.

Now, look, if the government decides at some point to take away your tax-exempt status, remember one thing, you're called to be salt and light, not tax exempt. Okay, so, oh, well. If it goes away, it goes away. It's going to make things harder, but still, you're called to be salt and light, not tax exempt. By the way, what would happen to many churches if states and the feds started taxing? What if the state started leveling, easy for me to say, levying property taxes on churches? I'll tell you, a lot of churches in urban areas would go under immediately. They couldn't afford to pay it. And especially, that if people couldn't give money tax free to churches, giving would go down, which would be a double whammy. They couldn't pay their taxes, and they couldn't pay their staff, and they couldn't pay for their building, and they couldn't pay for all these great ministry programs that they're paying for, because they gotta pay Uncle Sam.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Really? No. Very bad idea. Which is exactly what the Apostle Paul says in Romans chapter one, that if you suppress the truth long enough, due to sexual sin, you're going to be engaged in futile thinking. And that's what this is. This is futile thinking. But the religion of sex must have its way. It's a religion of the sword, ladies and gentlemen.

All right, sorry for that rant. I had to say something about that. Now, let's get into the questions I started with. Does the moral argument depend on everyone agreeing on right and wrong? Can human beings construct an objective moral standard independent of God? Are God's commands just based on God's desires? Are they based on his authority? Is there something else there based on? Can't evolution explain morality? What about changing views on morality? Does that mean there is no objective morality? And what about moral dilemmas? You know, you put somebody on a life raft, a bunch of people, and it can only hold four people. And if you keep five on it, they're all going to die. What do you do? Oh, morality is relative, then. Is that really true?

Well, here I got this letter from a retired attorney. And I'm going to read this letter, this email, in stages, and I'm going to respond to each stage. Now I'm not going to give you the name of this gentleman, because I'm going to disagree with almost everything this guy says. And he's not here to defend himself, so it makes no sense for me to give you his name. But here's what he wrote. And apparently, he's a believer because he starts it this way. "Even as a believer, I have difficulty following the argument you often make that non-believers have no objective standard for asserting moral claims. Sure, a believer can point to Go, but to a non-believer, that's no standard at all. God doesn't exist. The non-believer will say the believer has simply move the opinion argument up one level. It's your opinion, a non-unbeliever would say, that God exists, and your opinion that God's decrees provide an objective standard for morality. To a non-believer that's all nonsense. The believer is simply committing the logical fallacy of appealing to authority, in this case, to an authority the non-believer doesn't even believe exists".

Alright now, there's so much wrong with this, that it's going to be hard for me to cover it all before the break, but I'll start. First of all, the last sentence he says, the logical fallacy of appealing to authority. Here's what I'd like to say about that. Authority is not the heart of the argument. Goodness is. God's nature is the ground and standard of goodness, righteousness,

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

and justice. Without an external standard beyond human beings everything is merely a matter of human opinion. So, we're not talking about God just saying, do this and do that. What we're saying is, there's a standard of goodness, righteousness, and justice, and that's God's nature. If God's nature doesn't exist, those immaterial values, those immaterial virtues, don't exist. Now, since God is the greatest of all beings, he is all knowing, and he's the creator and sustain of everything that exists. He has authority over all of his creation, but his moral commands that comes through the New Testament and natural law, which by the way, are meant for the entire world, not just ancient Israel. Remember ancient Israel got the old covenant. Everybody else got the new covenant. And as we've talked about on this program before, many of the laws of the Old Testament were just for ancient Israel, they were not the ideal for all time. However, his natural law, and the laws of the New Testament, are for all time. Anyway, let me restate the sentence because I didn't finish it. His moral commands that comes through the New Testament and natural law aren't derived from his authority, but his goodness. In other words, he's not pulling rank and saying, do this merely because I said so. He's saying, he says, do this because it is good. It's in accord with my nature. And as the greatest being who knows all things, it's what's best for you in my creation. Here's the problem. Atheistic materialism has no standard of goodness. I mean, if all that exists are molecules, as the atheist claim, then how do you get something called goodness, righteousness, or justice? You can't. That's why I asked atheists whom I debate, how much carbon is in the justice molecule. There's no answer to that. Why? Because justice is not made of molecules. But if you're a materialist, and you believe in justice, you have to somehow explain it by molecules, and it can't be explained. That's why atheism is a worldview that cannot actually explain why reality is the way it is.

Alright. I'm Frank Turek. Don't go away. We're back in just two minutes.

Welcome back to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek here on the American Family Radio network. And of course, the podcast. And by the way, thank you so much for putting the positive reviews up there on the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast, iTunes page, wherever you listen to podcasts. That really helps us move it up the charts where more people can hear it.

Okay, we're talking about an email I got from a retired attorney. And the first section of this email was trying to say that, well, God is just an opinion of most people here and you're just

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

appealing to authority when you say God said, do this and do that. And my point is, no, we're not just appealing to authority. Of course, God has authority, but that's not why he's saying do X and don't do Y. He's not saying, don't murder because I said so. He's saying, don't murder because a human being is made in my image, and is inherently good, and so you shouldn't kill innocent people. On the other hand, atheistic materialism has no standard of goodness. Atheists, like all people, know goodness, but they have no way to justify it. In fact, as we'll unpack further here later, this is not an epistemological issue, but an ontological issue. Now, what do I mean by that? This is the biggest mistake made when atheists say, or non-believers say that they can explain morality without God. They confuse knowing morality, which is epistemology, with the actual existence of morality, or a standard, which is ontology. And as I say, I'll unpack this later. Let me just briefly say it here. Atheists can know right wrong. They can be good people, in the sense that they can do moral things, but they just have no way to ground what goodness is, what righteousness is, what justice is, if there's no God. Everything's just a matter of opinion. I mean, if all that exists are materials, how do you explain goodness, righteousness, and justice? You can't. They're not made of materials. So, atheists can know goodness, righteousness, and justice. They just have no explanation for why those things exist. Alright?

So that's my first thing I'd like to say to this gentleman suggesting that we're just appealing to authority. No, we're not. God is an authority figure, but the reason he's issuing commands to us is, not just because I said so. It's because he is goodness and he knows what's good for us. And atheists have no way of grounding, or explaining, why goodness exists. The second thing I'd like to say here is, there is no ultimate purpose to life if God does not exist. And even Richard Dawkins, and other atheists, will admit this. They will say, there is no purpose. We just dance to our DNA. In fact, Dawkins has famously said, there's no good, there's no evil, there's no justice, there's just blind, pitiless indifference. And DNA just is, and we dance to it to music. So, there's no right or wrong, and there's no ultimate purpose. But if there's no ultimate purpose, then you can't have objective morality. You need purpose for objective morality to exist. Let me give you an illustration of this. And I've said this before. In fact, I say a lot of things several times. And some you say, well, you know, you're saying the same thing. Yeah. If I do say the same things over and over again, what, because repetition is the mother of skill. I need to hear something five or six times before I got it, maybe 10 times before I can teach it. Repetition is the mother of skill.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Most of us, if you listen to something once, and I'm going on a tangent here, but it's important. If you listen to something once, within a week of what you listen to, you might remember 2% of it. 2%? Unless something really hit you, like an impact event, then you might remember it forever. Sometimes there's aha moments which you never forget, but the rest of it, you go, man, that was good, but I can't remember what was said. So, repetition is important. Let's say a football game. Here's the illustration. How do you know that your quarterback throwing a touchdown is better than your quarterback throwing an interception? You know that a touchdown is better than an interception because you know the goal of the game. You know, there's a purpose to the game. If there was no purpose to the game, you couldn't say that a touchdown was better for your team than your quarterback throwing an interception. In other words, someone set the purpose of the game and the rules. But if there is no purpose or rules, there are no good or bad plays. There are no good or bad plays from a pragmatic perspective, or good or bad plays from a moral perspective, if there is no purpose. There has to be a purpose for you to say, this is a good behavior, and this is a bad behavior. Here's the problem. If God doesn't exist, as even atheists will admit, there's no ultimate purpose to life and hence no right or wrong way to live it. Now, that's not to say you can't come up with your own personal purpose. Of course you can. People live for all sorts of different things. But there's no overarching purpose.

And what happens if your purpose interferes with somebody else's purpose? How do you arbitrate between those two? How would the Jews arbitrate with Hitler? Because Hitler, on one hand, would say, my purpose is to create the uber race, and in my view, Jews are getting in the way of creating that uber race. Where Jews are saying, no, our purpose is to have our own community and to live just like everybody else, but Hitler wants to take away our lives. Who's right? Who's right if there's no overarching purpose? Well, you can't say anyone's right unless there's no overarching purpose. It would just be the opinion of the Jews against the opinion of Hitler. There's got to be an outside source, an outside standard, a standard whose essence is goodness, righteousness, and justice. So, why we can come up with our own meaning, we can't come up with any ultimate meaning. And look, if there is no God, and there's just materials, one day we're all going to be dead anyway. And there's no ultimate meaning. Do you realize that everything that you do will ultimately mean nothing? Do you realize that everything you say will be forgotten? Do you realize that everyone you love will die and you will

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

never see them again? Unless God exists. Because we're going to heat death here. This universe is ultimately going to run out of juice and nothing's going to mean anything, ultimately, unless God exists. So, if there is no God, there's no good or no purpose, so, there's no reason not to kill human beings if they get in the way of your desires. The only reason would be to not kill them because you might get caught. And some other human being might throw you into jail. But why should you restrain yourself if you're the dictator? Why should Stalin restrain himself from killing everybody he wants to kill to get them out of his way and to take their stuff? Why should he not do that if he can get away with it? If there is no God, if there is no meaning, if there is no purpose, if there is no ultimate right and wrong, or ultimate authority who will hold them accountable? Why not?

Now obviously, thankfully, most atheists don't live this way. But that just shows that atheism is unlivable. They have to invent a moral standard, or steal one from God, to make life livable. You can't live as if there's no purpose. You can't live as if there is no right and wrong and we just dance to our DNA. You couldn't even hold anybody accountable if that were the case. You couldn't throw anybody in jail, not morally anyway, because they really didn't do anything immoral, if there's no standard, and if they didn't have free will. If they're just dancing to their DNA, how can you say they're really wrong? So, without God, none of this makes any sense. No, this what I'm saying here doesn't necessarily prove the Christian God. But if you continue to do the research, you'll realize that we are talking about the Christian God, because the Christian God is the true God. You have to look at the evidence for Jesus in order to know that. I'm simply saying, without some deity beyond reality, or beyond the universe, beyond us, everything's just a matter of opinion.

Now 10 years ago, it's been over 10 years. I can't believe it's been this long, but I had a couple of debates with Christopher Hitchens, the brilliant British atheist who sounded more brilliant than he was because he had a British accent. And I remember him asking me this question during the debate. We had a little crossfire period, and he said, would you rather have an atheist running the country or a Muslim who obeyed the Quran? Now, in retrospect, I would have said something differently than I said. At the time I said, well, you know, Christopher, I'd probably rather have somebody like you, an atheist running the country than a Muslim bent on jihad. Of course. But on reflection, I might ask him, what kind of atheist are you talking about, Christopher? An atheist like you, Christopher Hitchens, or an atheist like Joseph Stalin? Because

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

if that's the case, then those are two bad choices. Somebody who wants to commit jihad or somebody who wants to be Joseph Stalin. Okay?

I'd rather have a Christian who believes that there are certain rights and certain wrongs and that he's going to be held accountable if he gets out of line. I'd rather have somebody who believes that every human being is made in the image and likeness of God and deserves respect, regardless of what they believe. I'd rather have somebody who believes in punishment for evil. I'd rather have somebody who believes that there's a real purpose to life and that everybody has a right to life. Now, when he says, who would you rather have, when Hitchens says, who would you rather have, an atheist running the country or a Muslim obeyed the Quran, he's implying that there's a standard. That, according to him, atheists are better than Muslims, morally. That's basically what the question implies. Well, it depends on which atheist and which Muslim you're talking about. I mean, you can find atheists that are better than Christians, from a perspective, embarrassingly. But you can. You can find Muslims who are better than Christians. You can find Muslims who are better than atheists and atheists better than Muslims. But that's not really the point. The point is, what do you mean by better? What do you mean by good? What do you mean by right? Where did these concepts come from? Explain their ontological grounding to me, if you would, because that's what we're arguing here.

My debate between myself...my debate between myself, gee, can't even talk today, ladies and gentlemen. My debate with Christopher Hitchens, the title was, "What Better Explains Reality: Theism or Atheism?". So, we both had the burden of proof to explain why reality is the way it is. I don't think he gave evidence as to why reality could be explained on atheism without God. And when he writes a book, *God is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*, notice the word poison means basically, that religion is evil. It's a fun way of saying religion's evil. But how do you have evil unless you have good? And how do you have good unless God exists? So, he's actually proving our worldview when he says, religious people have done evil things. Or he's providing support for it. He's not proving it, but he's providing support for it. Because we admit that. We admit religious people have done evil things. If they haven't, we wouldn't need a savior. Of course, we've done evil things. That's why I said to Christopher in the second debate, I said, Christopher, I'm a hypocrite. I can't live up to what Jesus said and did. If I could, though, I wouldn't need a savior. And so, when people tell me I can't go to church, because there's too

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

many hypocrites down there, I always say, come on down, pal, we got room for one more. Of course, the church is a hospital for sinners. It's not a country club for saints. I know we're saints theologically, but you get the point. We still sin even though we're Christians, and that's why we need a savior.

Alright, a lot more coming up. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek. Website [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). CrossExamined with a D on the end of it. Back in two.

We're talking about the moral argument and misunderstandings about the moral argument. In fact, in next week's program, we're going to continue our discussion, because I can't get through all this material. I got so much to say, based upon what a retired attorney wrote me in a Q&A. And by the way, if you want to write with questions, the email is [hello@crossexamined.org](mailto:hello@crossexamined.org). I'm sorry I can't get to all of them. I try and get to as many as I can and try and answer them here on the air. Every once in a while, I can answer them via email, but I just can't keep up with all them. But you can take a shot. [hello@crossexamined.org](mailto:hello@crossexamined.org). CrossExamined with the D on the end of it.org.

Also want to mention, in addition to this week, being in Alaska, in fact, tomorrow, Sunday I'm going to be at a church in Anchorage, Alaska. And all the details are on our website. I'm going to be there...when am I going to be there? I'm going to be there at the 10:00am service and the 11:00am service. And what I'm going to do it in those two morning services is talk about, if you want to know what God is like, look to the heavens. Look to the heavens. And then, Sunday night at 6:00pm in Anchorage, I'm going to be talking about, "If God, Why Evil?" and we'll have Q&A there. The church is called, Anchorage Baptist Temple, Anchorage, Alaska. And then the next night, University of Alaska Anchorage. And then, the following weekend, outside of Seattle, about an hour and 20 minutes outside of Seattle, Shelton, Washington. I'll be there with JP Moreland and some others. The Illuminate 2019 Apologetics Conference. I'll be speaking three times. Friday night, October 25; Saturday a couple times, October 26. All the details are on our website. So, check that out at [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). And upcoming, we're going to be at reThink up in Eden Prairie, Minnesota. That's Friday, November 8 and November 9, along with Greg Koukl and the whole Stand to Reason team. That's a great conference. So, if you're anywhere near Minneapolis, that's where you want to be. And then November 13,

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

University of Maine in, I don't know if I pronounce this right. Orono, Maine. It's right near Bangor. Right near the capital. No, the capital's Augusta, isn't it? Yeah, it's near Bangor, Maine. Anyway, University of Maine coming up. Lot more on the calendar, check it out there.

Let's go back to our discussion now. The gentleman was trying to say that, well, the moral argument, you know, has, it's just an appeal to authority. I say it's not an appeal to authority. And atheists don't think that the moral argument shows that God exists. Well, here's my third response to that paragraph. The argument from the moral argument for God isn't the only argument for God. And look, when trying to explain reality, the moral argument is not the only evidence for the existence of God. There are several other arguments which corroborate that God exists. And they help support the truth of the Christian worldview. And you may ask yourself, what's a worldview? Well, a worldview is like the box top to a jigsaw puzzle. If you have the right worldview, all of the aspects of reality, or at least most of them are going to fit like puzzle pieces to the box top. What do I mean by reality? Well, the universe had a beginning. For example. How do you explain that? How do you explain the universe is fine-tuned? How do you explain the laws of nature? Or the genetic code? Or the laws of logic and our ability to reason? How do you explain that we have consciousness and free will? How do you explain the fact that everything that we know about the universe and things in the universe these things are finite? And they're composed? Well, how did they get composed? There has to be an uncompressed composer. How do you explain Old Testament prophecy? The resurrection? How do you explain spiritual experiences? Because for atheism, to be true, every single miracle claim and spiritual experience in the history of the world has to be false. Is that possible? Yeah, it's possible. Is it reasonable? No. No.

So, when you're when you're dealing with the moral argument, you realize this is not the only argument for Christianity. And if you have a worldview that can't explain these essential aspects of reality, I think you have an inadequate worldview. You say, atheists don't have a worldview. No, they do have a worldview. They may think they don't. But if they're just saying they lack of belief in God, as we talked about this last week, they're not really saying anything about the world. They're just saying something about their psychology. Okay, so what? You're not saying anything about the real world, then, you're just talking about your psychology. If you want to have a discussion with somebody else who is saying, I think that the best way to explain these things is God, and you're going to come out as an atheist and say, well, I just lack a belief, that's

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

the best way to explain it, okay, fine. Then how do you explain those things? Oh, I don't have to, I don't have to give an explanation for those things. No. You do if you're going to engage in ideas with someone else. Easy to smell a rotten egg; it's hard to lay a better one, as I pointed out last week, and you can get the details if you listen to last week's podcast.

If there are two detectives, and they come across a murdered body, they both have the burden of proof to explain who murdered that particular individual. If one of them says, I think suspect X is the murderer, and the other person says, well I just lack a belief in suspect X, and the first detective looks at the second one and says okay, you don't think it's my guy, who do you think did it. And the guy goes, well, I just lack a belief it's your guy. Is that guy a good detective? No. No, he's not a good detective at all. He needs to come up with his own suspect. Now, that's the problem here is that atheists don't come up with their own suspect, or at least they say they don't. Actually, they do. They talk about quantum vacuums, and evolution, and multiverses, and these kinds of things, but what evidence do you have that those things can create the universe that we have? What evidence do you have for that?

So, let me briefly go through some of these aspects of reality. And we're only going to get through, we're only going to get through one paragraph of the letter that this gentleman wrote me. We'll have to get to the rest of them next week. But let's talk about the creation of the universe out of nothing. How do you explain that from an atheistic perspective? To just simply say you lack a belief is not adequate. Yeah, you might lack a belief, but that's not telling me anything about what your explanation is for how the universe God created and the fact that it is fine-tuned from the very initial conditions. If you change the expansion rate an infinitesimal amount, none of us are here. Why? And what about the laws of nature? Why are they so precise and consistent? Atheists are always saying, well, the laws of nature can do X, Y, and Z. Where did the laws of nature come from? Laws come from law givers. And why are they so precise and consistent? All physical things change, but why don't the laws that govern physical things change? The laws of nature? There's only four of them that we know about; the strong and weak, nuclear forces, gravity, and electromagnetism. Where did those things come from and why are they so precise and consistent?

How about the constants and quantities in those laws of nature? Why are they so precise? If you were to change them by a fraction of a decimal point we wouldn't be here. There would

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

either be no universe or no universe that could support life. Why is the universe goal directed? This is what Thomas Aquinas called his fifth way to argue for God. Aristotle called it teleology. The whole universe is directed toward an end. Things in the universe are directed toward an end. Acorns are directed to become oak trees. Why? Why don't they become elm trees, birch trees, or sea horses? They don't have minds of their own, yet they, if left to themselves, if they get proper nourishment, if they get proper sunlight, they're going to become oak trees. They don't have a mind of their own yet they're going in a direction. If they don't have a mind of their own, there must be an external mind directing them toward an end. That is what Aristotle called the unmoved mover. That is what Thomas Aquinas called God. That's who Paul was referring to when he said, in Him, we live and move and have our being. And Christ holds all things together. And the writer of Hebrews says, God sustains all things by his powerful word.

Where did the billions of letters of precisely ordered information in every one of your 40 trillion cells come from? And where do these irreducibly complex structures that are in every one of your cells and throughout your body, where do they come from? You can't modify them gradually. These things are created and engineered. They're designed. How about the laws of logic and our ability to reason? In fact, I can't wait for next week's program, because I discovered this new quote from CS Lewis that just blows this idea that atheists have reasons against God out of the water. We'll see it next week. You're gonna have to tune in. I can't get to it right now. But why can we reason at all? Why do the laws of logic exist and why do our brains, why can they ascertain truths about the real world and then arrive at true conclusions? Valid conclusions.

How can you explain that just by molecules? By the way, where'd the molecules come from? Why are we conscious and free will? Saying that consciousness and free will are an illusion, as some atheists say, is first of all self-defeating. You'd have to be conscious to say that and you'd also have to say it freely for it to be true. Or, at least for you to know it's true. Because if you're going to say you don't have free will, then that thought you don't have free will, you didn't freely come to it. You were directed there by the laws of physics, so why should you believe it's true?

The argument from composition, I mentioned earlier, is another aspect of reality. Everything that we know about in the universe, including the universe itself, is composed, is composed of

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

*I don't have enough* **FAITH**  
*to be an* **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

parts. Well you can't go on an infinite regress of composers. There has to be an uncompressed composer that composed everything else. That's what we mean by God. Old Testament prophecy. Just read Isaiah 53 or Daniel 9. How do we explain that written hundreds of years in advance? How do we explain the resurrection if there's no God? Oh, Jesus didn't rise from the dead. There's some other solution. Really? You really think that's the case? You really think that people who were Jews, who thought that they were God's chosen people, would invent a guy who claimed to be God, which was blasphemy to them, and then say he rose from the dead even though he really didn't? And then they got beaten, tortured, and killed for saying that was true. You think they invented that?

Look, J. Warner Wallace, my friend who's a cold case homicide detective, when he finds a dead body, he knows there's only one of three reasons why that body's dead if it's murdered. There are not 1000 reasons. There's only three. There's either a sex issue, a money issue, or a power issue. Question. Did the New Testament writers get sex, money, or power for saying Jesus had resurrected from the dead? No, they didn't get any of those things. In fact, they lost power. They got persecuted. They're not making this up. And yet, you have to explain the resurrection if you're an atheist, by, I guess saying they made it up. It doesn't make any sense, friends.

Now we're gonna come back to this next week. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with Frank Turek. So, tune in next week for the rest of this. I'll see you then. God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)