

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

Is Chick-fil-A Chicken?

(November 23, 2019)

You can't serve both God and money. Apparently, Chick-fil-A thinks maybe it can. It looks like \$10.5 billion a year is not enough so they appear to have decided to serve money rather than God. I say "appeared" to because maybe the reports aren't completely true. Maybe they are going to walk this back somehow. But, according to recent reports, as you know, and by the way, this is not going to be the only topic of the program. We're going to go on to other topics, but we need to talk about this before we move on to other topics. It looks like Chick-Fil-A has become chicken. They're chicken. They're afraid now of what the LGBTQ activists have done and they're buckling. They're not supporting the Salvation Army anymore or Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

Now, why would they not support these groups anymore? Well, there's several articles you can read about this. Right now, I'm going to read from Michael Brown's article on stream.org. Stream, by the way, a great place to get good Christian conservative content. [Stream.org](https://stream.org). The article is called, [Chick-fil-A Learns You Can Never Appease the LGBTQ Activists](#). Here's a section of it. Chick-fil-A President and Chief Operating Officer, Tim Tassopoulos, not sure I'm pronouncing that name right. Anyway, COO, Tim explained, "There's no question. We know that as we go into new markets, we need to be clear about who we are. There are lots of articles and newscast about Chick-fil-A, and we thought we needed to be clear about our message." What does that mean? Anyway, Michael Brown goes on to say, "To be sure. Tassopoulos also announced, 'No organization will be excluded from future consideration, faith based, or non-faith based.'"

The message was loud and clear. Chick-fil-A needed to shed all the negative press and establish a new, untarnished reputation based on its charitable contributions, "in the areas of education, homelessness and hunger." In other words, Chick-fil-A has now said, "We're going to focus our charitable giving on education, homelessness and hunger." All right, news flash! Chick-fil-A, isn't that exactly what the Salvation Army and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes do?

I mean, obviously Chick-Fil-A can give or not give to whomever it wants. It's a free country. They don't have to give to anybody they don't want to, but don't say the reason you're not giving to the Salvation Army or the Fellowship of Christian Athletes is because you want to focus your giving on exactly what those organizations are already doing. That's what they do. Certainly, Th



I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Salvation Army; when I think of homelessness, that's who I think about. Feeding the poor? I think of the Salvation Army, don't you? Education? That's what Fellowship of Christian Athletes do. So, there's something else going on here.

Here's where Michael Brown says about it, "In the words of GLAAD (formerly the Gay Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, better named the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Disagreement), 'If Chick-fil-A is serious about their pledge to stop holding hands with divisive anti-LGBTQ activists, then further transparency is needed regarding their deep ties to organizations like Focus on the Family which exists purely to harm LGBTQ people and families.'"

This is just so ridiculous I don't even know where to start. I mean, did these LGBTQ...let me just not broad brush everybody, but does GLAAD really think that Focus on the Family exists purely to harm LGBTQ people and families? Are you so narcissistic that you think Focus on the Family was started and currently exists to harm you? If you really think that...I mean Focus on the Family was started in 1977. Homosexuality was hardly a blip on their radar, or the country's radar, in 1977. If you go to their [website](#), here's their mission: "To cooperate with the Holy Spirit in sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ with as many people as possible by nurturing and defending the God-ordained institution of the family and promoting biblical truths worldwide". There's not a word in here about LGBTQ stuff. This has to do with the gospel.

Now, obviously, Christianity has certain beliefs regarding sexual behavior for the good of everybody. So, that's an implication of Christianity. That may be an implication of the gospel. But that's not why they exist! By the way, do you also think that the Salvation Army exists as an anti LGBTQ organization? The Salvation Army began in 1865 in London. Now in 1865 in the United States, homosexual behavior was a felony in every state. Do you really think, folks, do you really think that the Salvation Army exists to stop LGBTQ policy? Is that why they exist?

Now, obviously, since the bedroom has been brought into the political arena by these LGBTQ activists, then there's going to be political implications here. But these organizations were not initiated, and don't exist, simply to resist certain political desires of certain sexual groups. That's not why they exist. Now, their beliefs may impact those things, but they don't exist for those reasons.

It amazes me that people are so myopic, and so focused on themselves, that they think anybody who disagrees with them has come into existence purely to disagree with them.



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Now, Mat Staver writes, in the *Christian Post*. The title of this article is, [Mat Staver Response to Franklin Graham Chick-fil-A is Now Funding a Pro-LGBTQ Group](#). So, Franklin Graham, whom I love, by the way; he doesn't suffer fools and he has no problem speaking his opinion. Franklin Graham apparently called Dan Cathy, the President of Chick-fil-A a couple of days ago and said, "Hey, are you going to still support the Christian groups?" Dan Cathy was firm that he would. I don't know all the details of the conversation, but Franklin Graham is basically saying, "Hey, don't worry about it. Chick-fil-A's okay."

You're listening to, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, with Frank Turek. We're back in two minutes.

According to Mat Staver, "In 2014, Chick-fil-A decided to stop funding the Paul Anderson Youth Home because it was accused of being "anti-LGBT." But it still had funding commitments with the Salvation Army and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, both of which are also falsely accused of being "anti-LGBT" because they have biblical policies on marriage and sex outside of marriage. Now that the funding commitment is expired, Chick-fil-A says it will no longer fund Salvation Army and FCA, even though the Salvation Army fits within its giving priority of funding organizations that provide housing and food banks, and FCA provides education. Instead, this COO, Tassopoulos, states Chick-fil-A will now fund Covenant House International, which is much smaller than the Salvation Army (in only 31 cities) and an LGBTQ activist." In other words, Covenant House is pro-LGBTQ behavior. Continuing from the article, "Tassopoulos, speaking of funding Covenant House states, 'This provides more focus and more clarity.' At least he is correct, and this clarity reveals the betrayal. The founder of Covenant House, a Catholic priest pedophile, was sued for allegedly sexually abusing the youth who were seeking shelter and food. Covenant House proudly promotes LGBTQ on its website, referring to quote, "LGBTQ Inclusion Initiatives," and even doing an "inclusion assessment" at every one of its facilities. Covenant House also proudly supports the New York City Gay Pride Parade with its own float, banners, t-shirts, and hashtag #Covunity. It's recognizing that national funder of LGBTQ causes."

Chick-fil-A is supporting this group over the Salvation Army?!? Really? We need some clarification. And we'll get to it right after the break.

Welcome to *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, with Frank Turek. We're actually live this morning here Saturday, the 23rd of November. It's rare we're live. Normally I'm on the road, but maybe, if we have time toward the end of the program, I'll get to your phone calls. 888-589-8840. 888-589-8840. We've got a little bit more to cover and I have many questions that you've emailed me. I want to get to a few of them today, if I can.



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Now again, Chick-fil-A can do whatever it wants. It's a free country. It's a private company. They don't have to give to anybody, but don't tell us that you're going to focus your giving on hunger, homelessness, and education and then say that Salvation Army and FCA don't fit those criteria. That's exactly what they do. There's something else going on here, isn't there Chick-fil-A? Well, I hope you'll explain because Christians for many years have looked to you as a kind of a beacon of how to do business in a hostile culture, and you're chucking all that for money? Really? Come on! You can't serve both God and money. Do what's right. Leave the results to God.

Anyway, we're talking about, at least initially here in the first part of the program, this whole Chick-fil-A fiasco. I'm reading again from Mat Stavers' article. This happens to be on the *Christian Post* where he says, "Chick-fil-A dumps the Salvation Army because it wants to expand into new markets and now shuns organizations the LGBTQ activists falsely call "anti-LGBTQ," and then turns 180 degrees to announce it will now fund Covenant House, a radical LGBTQ activist organization that celebrates homosexuality, transgenderism, and the entire political agenda. And Covenant House does not stop with LGBTQ activism; it also takes girls to abortion clinics." It has a story linked about someone from [Covenant House taking a girl to an abortion clinic](#). And this is what Chick-fil-A wants to support now. Really? We need some clarification! I hope Franklin Graham's right that everything's okay over there at Chick-fil-A. I'm not exactly sure. AFA, American Family Association, and you're listening to the American Family Radio Network right now, has right on their website a petition, if you go to the page afa.net you'll see it right there. [Chick-fil-A ends support for Christian charities](#). Sign our petition to Chick-fil-A. Check it out if you feel like signing it. It's almost up to 100,000 people right now. Maybe the great Tim Wildmon can go visit Dan Cathy over there at Chick-fil-A and bring all these petitions to him and say, "Hey, what's going on?"

[Ben Shapiro also has an article](#). Just came out a couple hours ago on Fox News. He says, "When the cultural left can't achieve what it wants through public mobilization, it simply uses the power of government to blackmail those it dislikes. So, despite the fact that Chick-fil-A had never discriminated against gay customers -- it would sell a chicken sandwich to anyone -- then-Boston Mayor, Thomas Menino [who's since passed away] promised to ban the franchise from the city. Then-Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel quickly followed suit, pledging to support an alderman's plan to block Chick-fil-A from opening a restaurant at O'Hare Airport. San Antonio recently blocked Chick-fil-A from opening a restaurant and its airport. . ." Let me stop right here. Thankfully, the Texas Governor stepped in and stopped that. So, I think San Antonio can now have a Chick-fil-A. Anyway, "and the airport in Buffalo, New York followed suit. San Jose,



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

California, pledge not to renew Chick-fil-A's lease when it ran out." I think that's not until 2026, so we'll see what happens there.

Here's what Shapiro goes on to say: "Our First Amendment culture is endangered when local governments are given the capacity to block businesses from operating, not on the basis of business discrimination but on the viewpoint of the company's founders alone. That's precisely what's happening here. If giving to Christian charities now bars you from opening a restaurant at the airport, our culture is beyond the point of no return." Alright, let me disagree with Shapiro right here. It's never beyond the point of no return because we're supposed to be salt and light in order to continue to do what's right and lead the results to God. But I agree with Ben here that this is a problem and you need to have your voices heard all around the country, ladies and gentlemen. I mean, if you can ban a company for what the founders think about biblical marriage, this is trouble for everyone.

Now as usual, the Babylon Bee puts it very well. They have a headline here this morning. Actually, came out yesterday. Babylon Bee, the Christian satire site, brilliant, says...here's the headline: [Chick-fil-A Replaces Cow Mascot with Golden Calf](#). Here's the write up. "Chick-fil-A corporate headquarters announced Friday that the restaurant will be getting a new mascot and place it the traditional Chick-fil-A cow: a golden calf. Restaurant patrons will be asked to dance around and worship the golden calf when they enter the restaurant to show their submission to the LGBTQ agenda. 'Take off the body piercings that your LGBTQ+ same-sex partners are wearing and bring them to me', said Dan Cathy in a solemn ceremony while creating the restaurants first-ever golden calf this morning. So all the people did so and brought them to Cathy. He took what they handed him and made it into an idol cast in the shape of a calf, fashioning it with a plastic fork. 'This is your God, people of Chick-fil-A, a who brings you great business and allows you to expand into other markets.' Then the people worshipped in a mighty dance. And there was much rejoicing. At publishing time, an angered Kanye West had entered the restaurant, and, spotting the golden calf, immediately threw down his copies of *Jesus is King* and *Jesus is King II*, shattering them to bits." Ladies and gentlemen, The Babylon Bee. if you don't know about the Babylon Bee, go to [thebabylonbee.com](#). Sometimes you can make a point better through humor than you can through the ranting and raving that people like me do. So, anyway, check that out there at the Babylon Bee. So, Chick-fil-A has decided that it's going to worship money rather than God, apparently. I hope that's not true. I'm hoping they're going to walk this back and say, "You know, we really didn't mean it." Let's just pray that is the case.



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Another article on [First Things](#) makes a couple of interesting points that I just want to bring to your attention Jake Meador is the author and he writes, "Despite their remarkable growth and ability to thrive even in liberal bastions such as New York City, the company has decided to stop supporting conservative organizations due to progressive pressure." Let me stop right here. Do you know that -I don't know four or five years ago- when Chick-fil-A opened their one of their first Manhattan Chick-fil-A, Mayor De Blasio up there said, "Don't go there." They're they're bigots and all this. They're still lined around the block at Chick-fil-A there at that location. Why? Because what they do is just too good. It's delicious. People are not going to stop going there because some mayor says, "Don't do this." Why would a mayor not welcome people who are always pleasant, always kind, serve everybody, have a great product, because you don't agree with their political position on marriage? Which, by the way, they've been on the right side for 5000 years. Same-sex marriage starts up 10 minutes ago and suddenly everybody must bow to the golden calf here. Is that what you're saying, Mayor?

Anyway, this Jake Meador goes on to say, "I suspect that this is because progressives, unlike conservatives, are willing to say, 'We know what the good life is and what human beings ought to be.'" So, we're going to push that on everybody. Now Christians, liberals, political and theological liberals, they believe what they believe, maybe to a stronger degree than what you believe. Why is that? I mean, Jesus is the truth. If there is no God, there is no ultimate truth, or there are no ultimate rights. You've got people out there who have no foundation for their beliefs pushing them, basically at the threat of the financial sword, on everybody else. Yet you, a Christian, who knows that Christianity is true beyond a reasonable doubt, who have God literally come to earth to add humanity to His deity and takes your punishment on Himself, you're part of that belief system. You don't think it's important enough to let other people know about? You don't think it's important enough to fight for? I don't mean picking up swords. Don't get me wrong, I mean, at least verbally. You don't think that's important enough? The truth is not important enough to persuade other people to at least know it, and encourage them to accept it? Yet, you've got this group of people out there who have no foundation for their beliefs. They have to steal from God in order to come up with rights at all. They're more vocal, and more persuasive, and more effective, than you are, and you have the truth? Shame on you. Shame on me. Shame on us.

There's a lot more to cover, ladies and gentlemen. There are those articles you can look at. And we'll see what happens with regard to Chick-fil-A. Again, you can go sign the petition at [afa.net](#), if you want Chick-fil-A...if you want to kind of smoke out Chick-fil-A and say, "You need to clarify what's going on here? Why are you supporting this Covenant House place, which is actually supporting behaviors that Jesus and the apostles, and of course God would disagree with?"



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Those behaviors hurt people and are against God's design for this universe. Why would you support those things, Chick-fil-A? We want some clarification because we've supported you and we want what's best for everybody. The Christian worldview is what's best for everybody, yet you're ready to chuck that for more money. Is that what you're doing? Let us know just so we know where everybody stands.

Now, I just got back yesterday from a conference out in California called, the Evangelical Theological Society, also a parallel organization called the Evangelical Philosophical Society. It's a group that meets every year in a different city. It's basically where scholars come together and give papers and have conversations. It's a complete nerd-out event. You have people reading their papers. You have probably 500 different lectures you can go to over the three days. And if you're a nerd, you'll love it.

So, I go to this thing when I can. One of the one of the presentations I went to was supposed to be a panel discussion on theistic evolution. In this panel discussion were three or four theistic evolutionists. These are people that claim to be Christians. Christian scholars who believe in evolution. Stephen Meyer of the Discovery Institute...you guys know Stephen Meyer. Had him on the program many times. Paul Nelson, also of the Discovery Institute. And of course, William Lane Craig, the great William Lane Craig.

They had this discussion on theistic evolution, and it was supposed to, at least in my view anyway, cover two basic questions. Number one is macroevolution compatible with Scripture? Question number two: does the scientific data support macroevolution and, if it doesn't, why should we care about the first question, is macroevolution compatible with Scripture? Well, you won't believe what happened here in this session. It was three and a half hours long. I'll give you kind of the two-minute summary of it right after the break.

You're listening to, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, with Frank Turek. Our phone number today, 888-589-8840. 888-589-8840. I hope you get to calls a little bit later in the program. If you want to call in, please do. We're back in just a couple of minutes. Don't go anywhere.

As we come into Thanksgiving week, and it has to do with being thankful, do you realize that it's impossible to be happy or content if you're not grateful- if you're not thankful? So, just keep that in mind. We have a lot to be thankful for. If you ever want to achieve any sort of contentment or happiness, you have to be grateful. You have to be thankful. Paul talks about this in Romans chapter one, that when we suppress the truth and try and go our own way, and



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

we worship the created rather than the Creator, and we're not thankful, we don't give thanks, we're on the road to destruction. Just keep that in mind. So much to be thankful for.

Anyway, let me go back to the meeting I just began to speak about before the break down in San Diego at ETS, Evangelical Theological Society, Evangelical Philosophical Society. It was a meeting on macroevolution. I said, at least we thought they were trying to deal with two questions. Is macroevolution compatible with Scripture? Does the scientific data support macroevolution? Well, to be honest with you, the theistic evolutionists didn't say much. I mean, it was rambling. They tried to generally say that the answer to number one, is [that] macroevolution is compatible with Scripture. They tried to say yes, although they didn't really give any solid reasons. By the time this whole thing was over, nobody had really given any evidence for theistic evolution, or macroevolution of any kind. I was there to hear number two: does the scientific data support macroevolution? Now, Stephen Meyer, who had 20 minutes to speak, as he always does, spoke eloquently about why macroevolution is not viable. The one thing that he tried to talk about, more than anything else, was the fact that mutations that could bring about new body plans are lethal. Any mutation that happens early on, in the embryonic process, or early on in a creature's life, that mutation is the only kind of mutation that could theoretically create some kind of body change later. Mutations to come later in the development process will not give you any kind of new body plan. The problem is, all of the mutations that occur early in the development of a creature tend to be lethal, so the creature won't live, which stops evolution right there. If the thing's dead, it can't go on.

Now, there are many other reasons to believe that macroevolution is not plausible. There's evidence against it. This is just one. The fact that the early mutations necessary for a change in body plans are lethal. Meyer also pointed out that, three years ago, November 2016, the Royal Society, a very prestigious scientific affiliation out in the UK, started by Isaac Newton, gathered people together to try and come up with a new theory of macroevolution because the current theory of mutating the genetic code doesn't work. It doesn't bring about new life forms. He pointed that out that you have all these evolutionists, these are people who are, many of them are atheists, but they're admitting that the entire mechanism that evolutionists point to doesn't work. It doesn't give you new life forms.

If the atheists are saying macroevolution doesn't work, why would any Christian say we need to adopt it into Christianity or need to somehow figure out if it's compatible with Scripture? It's not even true. So, why would you...it's like saying, "Why don't we see if we could get heliocentrism, and get that theory, and start supporting that theory, and then see if it's compatible with Scripture?" The idea that the sun goes around the Earth-why don't we see if



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

that's compatible with Scripture? Well, nobody's doing that. Why? Because we know that's not the case. There's no reason to see if it's compatible with Scripture. But I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, you could make a better case from Scripture, that the sun goes around the Earth, than you could that macroevolution is true. Yet, you've got people trying to claim that a theory, which doesn't even work, doesn't have scientific evidence behind it, arguably, it has evidence against it! They're trying to get Christians to support it when the scientific data doesn't support it. Why would you do that?

Paul Nelson also got up, and he was very clear, and said that naturalism is the real problem here. The reason people are trying to support macroevolution is because they have a philosophical bias against any kind of intelligent cause. William Lane Craig also gave a presentation there and he was kind of just trying to define what macroevolution was. At one point said, "I'm not a theistic evolutionist.", which relieved a lot of people because some people were thinking he was going that direction. He's not.

Anyway, when the Q&A started, one person asked of the theistic evolutionists, do they believe that the genealogy in the Gospel of Luke is true, which starts with Adam and goes through all the way up to Jesus. Do you think that's true? Most of them wouldn't answer, which is telling. I had the opportunity to ask a question and here's the question I asked. I said, "When Richard Dawkins was asked by Philip Johnson, what's your best evidence for macroevolution, Philip Johnson asked that of Dawkins. Dawkins replied this way. He said, 'The reason we know we are all ancestrally related, we know that evolution is true, is because we have a common genetic code.' Dawkins could be right. It could be evidence of a common ancestor, but could also be evidence of a common creator, or common designer. What is the best evidence for macroevolution that could not also be interpreted as evidence for a common designer?" I asked that question.

Well, you should have seen the blank stares on all the theistic evolutionists. None of them wanted to try and take on the question. One of them did, and he went on to say, "Well, broken genes look like it's good evidence for common ancestry anyway." Broken genes! You know, there are broken genes in humans, and maybe broken genes in apes, so they must share a common ancestor. Otherwise, we'd have to believe that God put these broken genes individually in these different kinds of creatures. It seems more plausible to suggest that no, they just share a common ancestor! That's why they have these broken genes. Stephen Meyer jumped in and said, "Well, we're looking at one of those broken genes right now and we don't think it's actually broken. We think it was designed that way." And that was it. Is the best evidence you have from macroevolution suspected broken genes? And even if that were



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

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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

evidence for a common ancestor, by what mechanism do we get all of these new life forms? Naturalistic mechanism? You could say, this could point to a common ancestor. Okay, maybe it does, maybe it could, but what mechanism gives you that? No answer was forthcoming.

Now, there's more on this that we're going to talk about a little bit later, but I just wanted to give you that kind of five-minute overview of what happened there. The bottom line to the entire thing is the fact that nobody gave a word of evidence, other than when I asked them to, for theistic evolution or macroevolution. Not a word. A three-hour discussion, no evidence. Well, why do you think it's true? Because some naturalists say it's true, and even they're doubting it.

Anyway, we'll keep a sharp eye on what's going to happen here. I think the Intelligent Design people are starting to make some headway, thanks to people like Stephen Meyer, Paul Nelson, and the Discovery Institute. But we'll keep an eye on it.

Alright. Let me answer a couple of questions and then I'll go to the phones 888-589-8840. 888-589-8840. G

Got a question, email question, from Daniel Andrews. Not very complimentary things, but I want to get right to the question. Here's what he says: "I'm reading, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, and I'm reading the chapter that is giving evidence for the accurate history of the New Testament. I hundred percent believe in the accuracy of the New Testament. My question is this: When we are discussing with skeptics that the New Testament is many more manuscripts than any other historical document, with Homer's Iliad being a distant second, how do we respond to the claim, 'Yeah, but the Iliad isn't proclaiming to be the only absolute truth leading to eternal life.' So, the number of manuscripts is really irrelevant. Just curious how you unpack that?"

Here's how I'd unpack it. The number of manuscripts doesn't necessarily tell you whether or not what's said in the manuscripts is true. It just helps you discover what the original New Testament said. You see, there are two questions that have to be decided here, Daniel. One is, do we have an accurate copy of the New Testament documents? That's question one. That's what the manuscript evidence does. Question two is: did the original New Testament tell us the truth, or do the original the New Testament documents tell us the truth? That's a completely different question. So, the question, with regard to the number of manuscripts, is just helping us establish that we do have an accurate copy of the original documents. Now we can have an accurate copy of a lie, right? That's certainly possible. To figure out whether it's a lie or not, we



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

got to go to the next question: are the New Testament documents telling us the truth? We've done that quite a bit on this program. We have 10 lines of evidence that the New Testament writers are telling us the truth. I don't have time to go through all that here, but no one is saying that because we have all these manuscript copies that everything the New Testament says is true. It's just telling us what the New Testament originally said, because we can compare all these manuscript copies and recreate the original with more than 99% accuracy. The question then is, is it really true? That's a completely other question. In a certain sense, the atheist, or the skeptic who is bringing this up, is missing the point. The point is, and whether or not it's true, the point is, do we have a copy of what the original said?

Joel asked this question "I've been wondering if the events described in the exodus account are supported by any other ancient accounts, especially Egyptian. Seems to me that such events would be recorded in Egyptian, not just Jewish documentation." Here's what we write in, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. We covered this there, Joel, so if you want to further you can go there.

Dr. Geisler and I say this: "While the Old Testament tells us of one embarrassing gaffed after another, most other ancient historians avoid even mentioning unflattering historical events. For example, there's been nothing found in the records of Egypt about the exodus, leading some critics to suggest the event never occurred. But what do critics expect? Here's what writer Peter Fineman imagines a press release from Pharaoh might say. 'A spokesman from Ramses, the great Pharaoh of Pharaohs, supreme ruler of Egypt, son of Ra, before whom all tremble in awe, blinded by his brilliance, today announced that the man, Moses, kicked his royal rear end for all the world to see, thus proving that God is Yahweh and the 2000 year old culture of Egypt is alive. Film at 11.' Of course no press secretary for Pharaoh would admit such an event. The Egyptian silence on the exodus is understandable. However, by contrast, when the Egyptians scored a military victory, they went to press, and they exaggerated greatly. This is apparent from the oldest known reference to Israel outside the Bible. It comes from the granite monument in the funerary temple of the Pharaoh Merneptah in thiebes."

What it says is telling. I'll get to it right after the break. You're listening to, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* with Frank Turek. Our phone number 888-589-8840. Back to your phone calls in just a minute.

If you're low on the FM dial looking for National Public Radio, you've actually come to the right place, because we're going to tell you the truth here. You're not going to hear this on NPR.



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

I don't have enough FAITH to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You're listening to, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* with Frank Turek, American Family Radio Network. website crossexamined.org. That's crossexamined with a D on the end of it.org. By the way, if you want an overview of why Christianity is true, just text the word evidence to 44222. Text the word evidence to 44222 and we'll send you the PDF of the PowerPoint presentation, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. You also get the first chapter of my book, *Stealing from God*. You'll get one email a week from us that will have a video in it, a short video, from the college campus, that you can share with other people and Q&A videos. By the way, all those Q&A videos are on our [YouTube channel](https://www.youtube.com/crossexamined), crossexamined.org. Check those out there. Again, the word is evidence to 44222

We were talking about a question from Joel about, why don't the Egyptians report the exodus? Because it was too embarrassing! I was saying, just before the break, that when they did have a military victory, the Egyptians proclaimed it. There's a Merneptah Stella, also called the Israel's Stella, which is basically a stone monument with inscriptions on it. The monument boasts about the military victory of Pharaoh in the highlands of Canaan claiming, "Israel is laid waste. His seed is not." Historians date this battle to 1207 BC, which confirms that Israel must have been in the land by then in order to be defeated by Egypt. We know that, according to Biblical dating, the exodus took place about 440 or so BC. This is 200 or so years later, and so anyway, they're not going to say anything about it because it would be embarrassing.

Now the Bible, unlike other ancient writings, reports all the embarrassing details and stories surrounding its supposed heroes, which is one reason I think it's telling the truth, because typically that doesn't happen. By the way, there's a lot of evidence that the exodus did take place and the Israelites wandered, but they wandered on the Saudi Peninsula, not the Sinai Peninsula. You can look up a website called, [Patterns of Evidence](http://patternsforevidence.org). My friend, Dr. Bob Cornuke, has also done some research on this. Mount Sinai is in Saudi Arabia, not the Sinai Peninsula. I don't have time to get into all that right now. We've talked about it before. Maybe at another point, we'll get into it some more. But that's the answer to that, Joel. Thanks for your question.

Shirley's been waiting long enough there in Tennessee. Shirley, you're on with Frank Turek. Go right ahead, ma'am. How are you?

Shirley:

Thank you so much for taking my call. I really appreciate your show. Got three quick points. But I want to say we know Sodom and Gomorrah existed because we got plenty of brimstone out there and [unintelligible] to prove it. But, you know, I've never been a big fan of Chick-fil-A. That's just me. I know a lot of African Americans love it, but I never did. The chicken was always



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

too salty for me. And number two, I never saw where the organization did anything but gave a little money here and there. They didn't get all into events and really seem to go out for events like some other, that are Christian events, like some other companies too. And the devil's logic makes no sense anyway. And I wanted to share this. How can people, Pharisees, ruled by Satan, believe that they could kill a man who's been raising people from the dead? I never understood that. And number two, how can these people think that they're going to just be raptured up out of here and never see any of the problems that will come, and the turmoil and the trials for Christians? How can they think that when the Bible is clear that many Christian heads will roll? So, they're thinking that the Holy Spirit will be removed from this place. I don't believe that. I don't believe when He says He's going to move that which was [unintelligible], He's talking about moving the four angels so that the

Frank:

But Shirley, as...Shirley, as you know, Christians have different views on eschatology, and I know people way smarter than me that have studied this. They come to opposite conclusions. So, I just know we win in the end. I'm not on the planning committee; I'm on the welcoming committee. Okay? So, when Jesus comes back, I'll welcome Him, but when He's coming back, only He knows. But anyway, your final point was what?

Shirley:

My final point is, I just believe that it's time for us to, as you said, focus on Christ. Really get our hearts and lives together. Share with other people.

Frank:

We have to.

Shirley:

And not hold back the gospel.

Frank:

Absolutely, Shirley. And see, that's part of the problem. There are people who are non-Christians who are sharing their worldview more effectively than we are. They're sharing their false worldview. They're stealing rights from God in order to say that they have certain rights, and yet God doesn't exist, when nobody has any rights if God doesn't exist. Yet, we're not sharing the truth that God does exist, and He loves everybody. He doesn't love everything we do, but He loves everybody. And everybody needs His grace. Whether you're LGBTQ, or



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

heterosexual, we all need God's grace. That's the message we should bring everywhere. Thanks for your call, Shirley. Appreciate it.

Let me go on to Sarah listening in; are you in Iowa, Sarah?

Sarah:

Oh, yes, I'm in Iowa.

Frank:

Go ahead, ma'am. How you doing?

Sarah:

Hi, I'm doing well. And thanks for your show and thanks for having me on.

Frank:

Yes, ma'am.

Sarah:

With the Chick-fil-A situation, I heard it in my heart saying...I agree with Shirley, it's not my favorite food. My family had frequented there just because we like their stand. I have four daughters. My youngest is 19, a freshman in college, and she's been fighting the fight there. And hope I don't get [unintelligible], but she, when I told her yesterday morning, she hadn't really heard. We hadn't had a chance to talk about that issue this week. And I said, though, "Nobody's boycotting." She's not really big on boycotting. But she goes, "We should." And she said, "This is a betrayal." And I just think, I see her, like she wrote her freshman her first essay on, why she's committed to Christ. Excuse me. Anyway, I just, I just see her out there on the front lines and I think Dan Cathy and that organization betrayed their stand.

Frank:

Well, I agree with you and that's why I'm hoping that they're going to clarify and walk back this misunderstanding, if it is a misunderstanding. It doesn't appear to be a misunderstanding, because if they are giving to Covenant House, and they know what Covenant House does, then it's a pro-LGBTQ group that is actively trying to advance that political agenda. And it is actually affirming this unbiblical, unnatural behavior. It's affirming the behavior. Now let me be very clear. All people, regardless of how they self-identify, are made in the image of God. So, we need to treat everybody with respect. We're not talking about people here. We're talking about



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

behaviors. If you're going to support certain behaviors that are against what Christ wants for us, how do you call yourself a Christian organization? Why would you call yourself a Christian organization? Why would you, on one hand, say that you're Christian and you love everybody, and yet, on the other hand, support something that you know is not loving, according to Christ. Why would you do that?

Sarah:

I agree. 100%.

Frank:

Hopefully they're going to change, Sarah. Only time will tell. I'm going to give them at least some of the benefit of the doubt right now and see if they make any statement this week, but I just...

Sarah:

I'm going to be signing the petition to encourage them to make a statement.

Frank:

Afa.net and God bless you for bringing up those girls and making them strong to stand for the truth. Now, everyone knows they're going to be persecuted for doing that, but that's what Jesus promised us. That kind of comes with the territory. Continue to affirm your daughter in what she's doing. Thank you so much, Sarah.

God bless. All right, Jim. I got just a minute, so we'll try and squeeze it in. How are you?

Jim:

I'm doing good. I'll try to make it quick. Haven't ever heard this question addressed, but I'm just saying if there was always a potential for sin in the beginning of creation, what is to stop and [unintelligible] occur in the heavens, because we still have angels? Apparently, angels had the potential for sinning in the beginning. I would think that that potential still existed, as well as man. And I know we don't want to be robots, and automations up in heaven, as well. We will have free will. So, I need some reassurance that sin, while being wiped out, so to speak...you know, I just don't know why wouldn't that . . .

Frank:

Yeah, it's an excellent question. Will we be able to sin in heaven? Now, angels are different from human beings. Angels are a different kind of being. You know, they're not material beings.



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

I don't have enough FAITH
to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

They're immaterial beings. It seems to me there had to be some, what we would call, [unintelligible] distance between angels and God before the fall. Otherwise, if they were in the complete presence of God, there wouldn't have been a fall. They had to have at least some distance between, and so God could give them the freedom to choose, right. But it seems to me that once we get to heaven, we'll still have free will, but there will be no need or desire to sin. Why? Because the reason we sin now is, we're trying to get good things, but we're taking shortcuts to get them. In heaven, there will be no need to try and get something we don't have because we'll have everything we need, and we'll see God for who He is. So, it seems to me, there won't be any impetus to sin, there won't be any desire to sin, yet we'll still have free will, which will allow us to love God for who He is. Without free will, obviously, we can't love. I think we will have free will in heaven, but it won't result in sin, because there will be no need to sin, because we will have everything we want. Thank you for the call, Jim.

Other Christian theologians might say, "Oh, we don't have free will in heaven." I actually think we will. Now we sin to get good things. In fact, if you think about it, the reason you sin is usually for one of three reasons, or a combination of the three: sex, money, or power. Relationships, finances, or power/prestige. There's not going to be any need for any of that in heaven. You won't lack any of that. There will be no need to do such a thing. You'll see God for who He is. First John 3 talks about basically the beatific vision. We'll see God for who He is and will be fulfilled. So, no, we won't sin in heaven.

Alright friends, great being with you, and we'll talk more next week. I hope you have a wonderful Thanksgiving. Remember you cannot be happy or content without being grateful. If you are grateful, it's really hard to complain too, isn't it? So, be thankful for what Christ has done for us and share that with others. God bless. See you next week.



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