

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Does Logic Apply to God? And Other Questions.

(February 22, 2020)

Does logic apply to God? That's a question that someone just emailed me that we're going to get into. How about, is morality subjective and determined by the majority? That was an assertion an atheist made that we're going to deal with. And if God is omnipresent, if he's everywhere, how can hell be separation from God? That would mean God is in hell, but hell is supposed to be separation from God, so how can that be? And if God came to you and said, kill somebody, he seems to do that in the Old Testament on a couple of occasions, what would you do? I mean, an atheist posed that question, as well. I mean, if you were to say, yes, we'd probably lock you up, wouldn't we? What do we do with that kind of question? Hopefully we'll get to all these questions today.

You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek here on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is crossexamined.org. That's cross examined with a D on the end of it. org. By the way, I'm going to be in Nebraska this entire next week, starting tomorrow, Sunday. All the details are on their website or on our website crossexamined.org. Doing several colleges, all University of Nebraska. First in Kearney, then in Lincoln, then in Omaha, and I'll tell you more about that a little bit later in the program. But let's dive right into these questions.

The first question, which we'll spend a little bit of time on because going to take a while, is about logic. Does logic apply to God? And Steven writes in and says, "First, thank you for what you do. You've been an amazing resource and inspiration." Thank you, Steven. He says this. "You and other apologists often cite the laws of logic, more specifically the law of non-contradiction, that a statement can't both be true and false at the same time and in the same sense, although the laws of identity, and the law of the excluded middle, are usually implied."

Alright, let me stop right there. Yes, those are basically the three essential laws of logic. The law of non-contradiction; opposite ideas cannot be both true at the same time and in the same sense. The law of identity; A is A, it's not non-A. So, if I'm looking at a tree right now, and I say,

**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**

"Yeah, that's a tree. It's not a non-tree." Okay, we got that. And then the law of the excluded middle, means there's no middle alternative. Either there's a tree out there, or there's not a tree out there. Either God exists or he doesn't exist. There's no middle alternative. Either you are pregnant, or you're not pregnant. There's no middle alternative. Either Jesus rose from the dead, or he didn't rise from the dead. There's no middle alternative.

So, those three laws of logic are laws that we use to know everything about reality, or at least a reason to conclusions about reality. We use our senses to get information and then we apply those laws of logic to try and draw valid conclusions about the real world. Anyway, here's Stevens continued question about, does logic apply to God? He says, "For example, I was watching a piece on Closer to Truth", which is a PBS program that you can watch some of it on YouTube. And the title of it is, *Is God Outside of Time?*" William Lane Craig was leaning into the laws of logic to make this point and the question has struck me, 'Why does God have to follow the rule of logic, or at least our limited understanding of it?' As I understand it, the only limits on God are those that he chooses to place on himself. How can we accredit God infinite power, just so long as his actions and properties follow the rule of logic? God invented logic just like he invented time and gravity."

Alright, let me stop right there. That's Stephen, writing in with this question. Let me respond to that. I don't think that God invented logic like he invented time and gravity. The laws of logic are grounded in the nature of God. They couldn't have been otherwise. They couldn't have been different. Whereas the laws that governed nature, they could have been different. The laws of gravity could have been different, or the law of gravity could have been different. The law of electromagnetism. The strong and weak nuclear forces. Yeah, they could have been different, because they're not grounded in the nature of God. But the laws of logic are grounded in the nature of God.

By the way, this is one reason that the fine tuning argument is so impressive, even for some atheists. Christopher Hitchens famously said that the most difficult argument as an atheist for him to answer was the fine tuning of the universe. The laws of nature, they could have been different, and we know they could have been different. The problem is if they were different, then either the universe couldn't support life, or the universe would have collapsed back on itself shortly after the Big Bang. So, the laws are extremely fine-tuned, as well as some of the constants and quantities that we use to describe the laws of nature, that if you were to change any one of those laws, or any one of those constants, or the initial conditions of the universe,

**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**

we wouldn't be here. There would be no life in this universe, or there would be no universe at all. And so, those laws could have been different. Now, they're not different because, in my opinion anyway, the reason they're not different is because the creator wanted to create a universe that would have life, namely us. And that's why he set them the way they are. But they could have been set differently and it wouldn't have violated God's nature.

However, the laws of logic are grounded in God's nature, and I think this is implied in the Bible. For example, John, the eyewitness of Jesus' resurrection, who wrote the gospel of John, and three other books in the New Testament. Well, four actually, if you add Revelation. He wrote first, second, third John and Revelation. And then of course, the gospel of John. He starts his gospel, his biography of Jesus, this way. "In the beginning was the Word" or "In the beginning was the logos". Now the logos is from where we get the word logic. In the beginning was the mind, if you will. He didn't say, In the beginning was the gravity, or in beginning in the beginning was the molecule. No, in the beginning was God. In the beginning was the Word. In the beginning was the logic. That's the essence of reality. Mind.

In fact, if you think about all of the world views out there, you can boil them all down to one of two options. Either matter came from mind or mind came from matter. Either matter came from mind or mind came from matter. Now we know matter's not eternal. We know matter is composed. If it's not eternal, and it's composed, it must have a composer. And it had to have a beginning, if it's not eternal. It seems the essence of reality is a mind. And that mind is what we mean by God's nature. So, in the beginning was the mind, the logos, the word.

And logic is grounded in that mind. It's not an arbitrary invention of the mind. Logic is the mind, if you will, that the laws of logic are derived from that mind. And you can imagine different laws of nature, you can't imagine different laws of logic. In fact, as soon as you start to imagine, you're using the laws of logic. You're assuming that one thing is not another thing. You're assuming that opposite ideas cannot be both true at the same time and in the same sense. You're assuming that if you have just A, or non-A, there's no third option. Either God exists or he doesn't exist. You're using the laws of logic to think at all to imagine anything. So, this is the essence of reality.

I was at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, I think, probably 2014 or so. And I had gone through the, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist material. And I had talked about the cosmological argument, where the conclusion is, is that God is spaceless, timeless, and immaterial. And a graduate student got up to the microphone. He had a T-shirt on. It had a cross, and through the cross it had the universal negation sign, you know, the circle, the red

**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**

circle with the line through it. And on the bottom, it said, Bad Religion. So, I knew this man was open-minded. Anyway, he got up there and he said, "You just said that God was spaceless, timeless, and immaterial. Can you tell me anything else that's spaceless, and timeless, and immaterial?" And I said, "Yes, the laws of logic." And he said, "Well, I would argue the laws of logic don't exist then." And I said, "So, you're saying they do exist?" And he said, "No, I'm saying they don't exist." And I said, "No, you're saying they do exist." He said, "No, I'm saying they don't exist." I said, "No, you're saying they do exist." He said, "How am I saying they do exist?" I say, "Because you're using the laws of logic right now to contradict me. You're using the law of non-contradiction to say that my view of your view is wrong. You can't think the thought without the laws of logic. You can't take a thought without the law of non-contradiction, or the law of the excluded middle, or the law of identity. They're the essence of thought. You use them to reason to everything else." And then we went back and forth. And he said, "Well, I would argue them the laws of logic are just human conventions. They're just invented in the human mind." And after the break, I'll tell you how I responded to that.

You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is crossexamined.org. That's cross examined with a D on the end of it. org. Also, our app, two words in the App Store. Cross Examined. Check that out. It's free. A lot of great stuff on it. We're back in two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, can you help me with something? Can you help me get this podcast before more people, not only tell your friends about it, but go up to iTunes and put a five star review on the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast. If you do that it will help us move the podcast up the charts so more people will hear it. Thank you so much for partnering with me on this.

Did God invent logic for arguing? No, he didn't. That logic is grounded in his nature. So, let's go back to the story from University of Wisconsin at Madison where the atheist said, "Well, I would argue that the laws of logic are just human conventions. They're made up by the human mind." I said, "Okay, let me ask you a question. Before there were any human minds on the earth, was the statement, there are no human minds on the earth, true?" Well, he didn't like that. He didn't like that question. He knew the answer was, yeah, it would be true, which means that his assertion that the laws of logic are grounded in human minds has to be false. Because, before there were any human minds on the earth, that statement was still true. So, these laws are not human conventions. He finally admitted that, after hemming and hawing for a while. But no, to a certain extent, he was right, that laws are grounded in a mind. Just not human minds. They're grounded in the great mind, the mind of God. That's ultimate reality. They're not

**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**

grounded in our mind. We use these laws in order to think, and in order to communicate with one another, but we didn't invent these laws. We use these laws as a bridge between minds, but we didn't invent them.

In fact, you couldn't understand a thing I was saying right now if you had your own private views, or your own private laws of logic, and I had my own private invented laws of logic. We couldn't communicate at all. The only reason we can communicate, or one of the reasons we can't communicate is because, we have these immaterial laws of logic, grounded in God's nature, that we use as a bridge between minds. We didn't invent the bridge, but we use the bridge. So, we can communicate with one another. We're not just locked in our own skulls, because these laws actually exist, and they're grounded in the mind of God.

Now, you can't make any logical argument for logic. You can't defend reason by reason, because defending reason by reason would be circular. We have faith that reason works. There are no principles behind the laws of logic. They are the principles that you use to discover everything else. You have these laws, you get sense data from your senses, and you use these laws to evaluate the sense data from your senses, in order to draw valid conclusions about the real world. That's how you know things. That's epistemology. That's how you know things. But ontology answers the question, why do those things exist in the first place?

For example, I can look out my driveway and see there's a Hyundai out there. How do I know there's a Hyundai out there? Because I have senses and I can look out there and see that there really is a car called a Hyundai out there. That's epistemology. That's how I know that the car is out there. But why is the car out there? That's an ontological question. Well, because there's a car company called Hyundai, and they made the car, and I went and bought the car. That's why the cars there. But how do I know it's there? I'm using my senses. So, how do I know something is true or false? I use the laws of logic. But why do the laws of logic actually exist? Because they're grounded in God's nature.

Now, back to Stevens question. His next line is this, after saying that he claims that God invented logic. He says, "To me, this feels like we're trying to put God in a box." All right, let me stop right here. When somebody says something like this, and Stephen's a Christian, I'm just saying, even among Christians, we ought to be using the questions. When somebody says, we're trying to put God in the box, you have to ask, what do you mean by a box? I mean, if you mean that God has limits on the attributes he has, then no, then God doesn't have limits on the attributes he has. But if you mean that God has certain attributes and not others, then yes, God is in that box where he has certain attributes and not others.

**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**

In other words, God is not some amorphous, undefined, New Age type spiritual mystery. He has definite attributes that distinguish him from his creation and other heretical views about himself. Without logic, you couldn't have a difference between say, the God of the Bible and Allah; or God of the Bible and Zeus; or God of the Bible and any god you could imagine. You have to use the laws of logic in order to understand who God is. And the laws of logic must exist in order for God to have a certain nature, and not another nature.

See, without logic being a foundational aspect of reality, in other words, without logic coming from God's nature, and applying to all of reality, including himself, then how could you say, God is loving and not evil? Without logic, and without it being a foundational aspect of God's nature, how could God be just and not unjust? See, because if the laws of logic are just invented by him, then he could be just and unjust at the same time and in the same sense. But if they're grounded in his nature, then God is just and he's not unjust. Without logic, how could God be self-existing and not contingent? How could God be a necessary being and not a created or contingent being, in other words? Without logic, how could God be the truth and not a liar? How could he be moral and not immoral? How could he be immaterial and not, at the same time, a composed object? Logic is necessary. Without logic, how could Jesus have been resurrected from the dead and not dead in the tomb at the same time and in the same sense?

You see God is in a box that is bordered by his necessary attributes, which include logic. But God is infinite in all of the attributes he has. But without logic, you wouldn't even know what infinite was. You wouldn't even know what finite was. You wouldn't know what just and unjust was. You wouldn't know how they were different. So, it seems that logic is grounded in God's nature. It's not an invention of his. It's grounded in his nature. We have these cute sayings, Oh, we can't put God in a box. No, actually you can, if the box is infinite, and it includes His infinite attributes, and excludes other attributes. God is not evil, he's good. God is not unjust, he's just. God is not a material being, he's an immaterial being. So, it depends on what you mean by the word box.

And then Stephen goes on to say this. "To me, this feels like we're trying to put God in a box." He says, "I believe it still requires God to play by our rules, or at the very least, the rules that we can understand. In my mind, omnipotence and Isaiah 55:8-9 pretty much indicate that God does what he chooses to do, in the manner he chooses to do them, for his own reasons, and he does not owe us an explanation." All right. Well, much of what you say there is true, but I don't think it's completely true, Stephen. Let me explain why.

**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, you could take that to say that God's logic is higher than our logic, if you want to just take those two verses without looking at the context. But, as with any Bible passage, you have to make sure you know what the context is. And in this case, the context is not talking about logic. You say, how do you know? In fact, let me let me go back to something I've said on this program before. And by the way, some of you say, "Oh, you repeat the same stuff over and over". Yeah, I do. Why? Because repetition is the mother of skill. You need to repeat things over and over again. And secondly, the older I get, the more I realize the essentials are really what we ought to be focusing on. And the non-essentials, obviously, we can have liberty on. So, you have to repeat things in order to make them part of your everyday parlance. In order to make them roll off your tongue easily, to roll out of your mind easily. You know, you hear something once, you might not remember it. You hear something over and over again in the same way it's said, the same phraseology, then it can become internalized, and therefore, then you can share it with others.

First of all, when you say that God's omni potency does pretty much what he chooses to do. That's true, to a certain extent, but it also sounds like God is Allah. That God has no moral boundaries on himself. God can do whatever he wants. If he wants to call rape good today, then it's good. Tomorrow he'll call it evil, then it's evil. That's the Muslim view of God. That God is a voluntarist God rather than essentialist God. Essentialist means that God's nature is the standard of goodness, whereas voluntarism says that, whenever God decides is the standard of goodness. And that's not the God of the Bible. But let's go to his passage that he brings up. This is a common passage that it quoted by many people, Isaiah 55:8-9. Let's read it. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways declares the Lord. As the heavens are higher than the Earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts higher than your thoughts."

But here's something I've said before on this program. There are no verses in the Bible. There are no verses in the Bible. The verse divisions were put in about 500 years ago to help us navigate the text, which is good, because it's a really long series of books. It would be hard to figure out where you are, particularly the book of Isaiah. What are there, 66 chapters in the book of Isaiah? Which is interesting. There are 66 books in the Bible, but 66 chapters in in Isaiah. Where are you in Isaiah? Well, let's put chapter and verse divisions in there. The problem is, when we do that, we tend to think that we can take a particular passage out of context and make it say whatever we want. And here's a typical situation where people do that. They take verses eight and nine, and they make it seem like, oh, God's logic is so far past ours that he can do whatever he wants. It could be even illogical. That's not the context of the passage. Just go back to the previous verse. And in fact, we'll go back to verse six. Here's what it

**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**

says. "Seek the Lord while he may be found. Call on him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake their ways, and the unrighteous their thoughts. Let them turn to the Lord and He will have mercy on them, and to our God, for he will freely pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts. Neither are your ways my ways."

Now, what thoughts is he talking about in verse eight? He's not talking about God's thoughts that are logically better than human thoughts. He's talking about God's thoughts are morally better than human thoughts. Because the thoughts in verse eight refer back to the thoughts in verse seven. And the thoughts in verse seven are talking about unrighteous people, the wicked people. He says, "Let the wicked forsake their ways and the unrighteous their thoughts." Yes, God doesn't think morally like we think. God doesn't think morally like we think. His moral thoughts are higher than our thoughts. Not that his logical thoughts are higher. God's logic is just our logic. Now, obviously, God knows a lot more than we do. Don't get me wrong. And obviously God knows things we don't know. And he does things for reasons we don't always know. But that's not what this passage is teaching. This passage is teaching that God's moral thoughts are higher than our moral thoughts, because our moral thoughts are often unrighteous and immoral.

All right, you're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek and the American Family Radio Network. Website crossexamined.org. We're back in two minutes, so don't turn off this podcast or this radio program. That's an order. See you in two.

Yes, God's ways aren't our ways. But in the context of Isaiah 55, he's talking about our moral ways, not our logical ways, although sometimes we're illogical. We operate. That's certainly true. But again, that's not what that passage is teaching. Isaiah chapter 55: 8-9, he's talking about moral thoughts, not logical thoughts.

By the way, I want to mention that this weekend, I am going to be spending a lot of time in Nebraska with my friend, Tim Stratton, Free Thinking Ministries. First, gonna be at Kearney eFree Church tomorrow, 9:15 and 11:00 am (CT). That's the 23rd of February. Then doing an event for Tim that night. That's probably not open the public. Breakfast with some pastors the next day. Then University of Nebraska at Kearney. Tim will teach some of that with me. Hope you guys can show up there. And then University of Nebraska at Lincoln on the 25th. That's Tuesday. Then University of Nebraska at Omaha on Wednesday. Now ladies and gentlemen, if you would, would you just pray my voice holds out for all this? I look back at this I go, why am I doing three college events in a row? Well, because they were available, and they want to do them, but it's hard on the voice. So, please pray that my voice holds up.

**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 then, two days later, I'm in Dallas with our friends at reThink. Our friends at Stand to Reason. reThink. So, you don't want to miss that if you're anywhere in the Dallas area. It's not just me, it's a Greg Koukl, and J. Warner Wallace, and Tim Barnett, the whole Stand to Reason crowd, Alan Shlemon, others. Drew Worsham, who does it who does a great job. He's an illusionist and a pastor. He does a great job wowing the kids with some of his illusions. So, you don't want to miss that. That's at Cottonwood Creek Baptist Church in Allen, Texas, this Friday, the 28th and Saturday, the 29th. I just pray that I'll be able to speak by Saturday. I also got to mention that CIA is coming up in Dallas. It's going to be August 6-8, 2020. All the details are on our website. You want to be part of the CrossExamined Instructor Academy, learn how to present this information, then check out CIA and sign up soon. We're going to fill up quickly down there. We can only take about 60 people. So, check that out as well.

Okay, got a question that I'll continue from last week. Christian had an interaction with an atheist and one of the responses that Christian brought up to the atheist, after Christian presented the moral argument to this atheist, here's what the atheist said on Facebook. "Morality is subjective towards the majority. Torturing babies for fun is morally right for the assailant, but the majority of the population thinks otherwise, thus the assailant is punished." All right, let me stop right here. He didn't answer whether or not it's really wrong. He said the assailant thinks it's morally right, but if the majority decides otherwise, the assailant is punished. Okay? And then he goes on to say, this atheist, "It is only natural for us to disagree with each other, which is why we have this thing called majority vote."

Okay, he's confusing, at this point, that something is morally wrong with how we know it. Okay, this is something atheists always misunderstand. You can know morality in a lot of different ways. That's epistemology. But why something is right or wrong, that's ontology. Go back to our example earlier. I can see there's a Hyundai in my in my driveway, but that there's a Hyundai in my driveway, why is it there? That's an ontological question, not just an epistemological question. So, if torturing babies for fun is really wrong, why is it really wrong?

Anyway, this atheist goes on to say, "The majority will decide what is morally right. That is reality. You're approaching this with the mindset of God definitely exists. You're already biased, right off the bat. I'm an agnostic atheist, and I'm not dismissing the possibility of God, but I won't believe that any of the gods exist until I see one." Okay, well, there's a big mess in here.

First of all, when somebody says torturing babies for fun is just subjective, you don't really need to say anything other than, "Really? You think it's just a matter of opinion? You think 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**

Holocaust is just a matter of opinion? Do you believe a woman has a moral right to an abortion?" "Yes, I certainly do." No, she doesn't. How can she? If there's no God, there's no rights to anything. You believe same sex marriages are right. Yeah, I do. How can it be right if there's no God? It's just your opinion. They're not really rights. They're just preferences. Anything you think that is morally right or wrong is only your opinion, unless God exists? He goes on to say, this atheist. I won't believe any Gods exist until I see one. Really, you're assuming God is something you see with your eyes?

You know you believe in a lot of things you've never seen. You believe in your mind. Have you ever seen it? No. You believe in the laws of logic. Have you ever seen those? No. You believe in gravity. Have you ever seen gravity? Sure, Frank, I see things fall to the ground all the time. You're not seeing gravity. You're seeing the effects of gravity. We don't even really know what gravity is. Did you know that? You're seeing the effects of gravity. And that's how we know God. We know God by his effects. We see a creation; we know there must be a creator. Obviously, the effect is creation and the causes the Creator. You see design in the universe. That's the effect. The cause must be a designer. You have a moral law written on your hearts. You know that torturing babies for fun is wrong. You reason back to a moral lawgiver, whose nature His goodness. And any deviation from that goodness is what we call evil, whether the majority agrees with it or not.

See, you can't convict the Nazis if you're going to say majority vote decides what's right and wrong. How can you say the Nazis were wrong? They're just following orders. They're just following what their majority of their plurality said. You've never seen love, yet you believe it exists. It's not a physical thing you see, it's an immaterial reality grounded in the nature of God. You've never seen George Washington, but you believe he exists. Why? Because he's left effects behind that are best explained by George Washington. And you're saying I won't believe anything unless I see one. Well, again, there's so many things you believe you don't see. And you're assuming that evidence leads to knowledge, but why should evidence lead to knowledge?

If you're an atheist, how do you explain that we can know anything, not just God. How do you explain that we can know two plus two equals four, or the sun exists, or a tree exists? Why should you believe that if you're a molecular machine, a moist robot? If you don't really have a mind, but just a brain? Why should your brain even be able to tell you anything that's true or not? It's driven by the laws of physics completely. Why? Because you're stealing all these things from the theistic worldview in order to say that theism is false. You're stealing from God to argue against him. And much of this is all in the book, *Stealing from God*, as you know, friends.

**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**

In fact, if you think about morality, it has to be objective because people, obviously, intuitively understand it is so and they demonstrate it when they make their statements, even while denying it. For example, they'll say, there is no objective morality, therefore, it's wrong for you to impose your morality on me. Well, wait a minute. Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. If there is no objective morality, how could it be objectively wrong for you to impose your morality on me, or for me to impose my morality on you? How could that be objectively wrong? You just told me there's no objective morality. Then it can't be wrong for me to do whatever I want to you. It's just a subjective matter of opinion. You don't believe that. You're saying you believe it, but in your next breath you're saying you don't. You're saying there is no objective moral law except this one right here. Don't impose your morality on me. Wait a minute. That's an objective moral law.

How about this. You must be inclusive, tolerant, and diverse. And then as soon as you disagree with them, they won't tolerate you. Right? You must be inclusive, tolerant, and diverse. If you don't agree with us, we won't tolerate you. How about, don't impose your morality on us? That's what some on the left will say to some on the right. Don't impose your morality on us. And then in the next breath, they'll say, if you don't do what we want you to do, we'll sue you. What? Isn't that you imposing your morality on us? You're doing the same thing you said we shouldn't do?

Look, you can't have it both ways. Well, you can. You try and have it both ways. I mean, the folks who say they're fighting for tolerance are often the most intolerant people out there. They don't tolerate people that don't agree with them. And that is not the definition of tolerance. In order to tolerate someone, you have to disagree with them. If you agree with them, then you agree with them. You don't tolerate people you agree with, you agree with them. Tolerance implies you disagree with them. And when they say, don't impose your morality on us, I always say, Look, this isn't my morality. I didn't make this stuff up. I didn't make up the fact that murder is wrong, that theft is wrong, that rape is wrong, that abortion is wrong, that men were made for women and women were made for men. And the best way to perpetuate and stabilize society, which is the reason that governments involved in marriage to begin with, is to legally recognize the man woman relationship over every other sexual relationship.

I didn't make any of this stuff up. This isn't my morality. This isn't your morality. This just happens to be the morality. The one Thomas Jefferson said was self-evident. And the one the Apostle Paul said, "Is written on the hearts of all men", in Romans chapter two. So, if you have a problem with the morality, you don't have a problem with me, you have a problem with 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**

Creator on whose nature this morality is derived. How about they say this. Men and women are the same. And in the next breath, they'll say a man can transition into a woman. Well, wait a minute. If men and women are the same, then there's no transition going on at all. They're the same. They're the same creature. There's no differences, right? Then why would women want to transition into a woman, or vice versa, if men and women are the same? In one breath they'll say, diversity is our strength. In the next breath they'll say, we're all the same. But wait a minute, wait. If diversity is a strength, then people by definition have to be different. But if we're all the same, if there's no difference between men and women, how can we be different? How can diversity be our strength? On one hand they'll say, we're born this way. On the other hand, they'll say, gender identity is fluid. Wait, 10 minutes ago, you were claiming you were born a certain way. Now you're saying that you can wake up as a man and go to bed as a woman.

Look, logic applies to reality. And it applies to morality, as well. And if you're going to say, on one hand, that everything is subjective, on the other hand, act as if objective morality exists, and you have their objective morality, you're just being inconsistent. On one hand, some folks will say, you ought not judge, on the other hand, in the very next sentence, they'll call you a bigot. Well, wait a minute. If we're not to judge, why are you judging me as a bigot? And oh, by the way, what do you mean by bigotry?

I remember homosexual activist asked me that question once or accused me of being a bigot. And I said, "What do you mean by bigotry?" He said, "Fear and intolerance". I said, "That's not bigotry. Bigotry is making a decision about something before you have any evidence for it. It's a bias. It's a prejudice. Now, if anyone is a bigot, with all due respect, sir, you are, because I have reasons for why I hold certain moral positions. I have them all in this little book called, *Correct, Not Politically Correct; How Same-Sex Marriage Hurts Everyone*, and you haven't read a word of it. So, if anyone is making judgments without having any evidence, it would be you not me."

Anyway, there's more. More questions we'll get to you right after the break. You're listening to, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Don't forget about our website and don't forget about the University of Nebraska. All this week, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. Kearney, Lincoln, and Omaha. Hope to see you there.

Yes, we just touched a little bit on the sexual issues, which are so prevalent in our society today, and we did so most of the entire program last week. So, if you missed last week's podcast, go back and listen to that. But also, Dr. Sean McDowell is going to address this topic in great detail

**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**

in a new course. It begins April 1, it's called, Addressing Homosexuality with Clarity and Compassion. Addressing Homosexuality with Clarity and Compassion. This course is going to fill up quickly, so if you want to be a part of it, you need to go to crossexamined.org and click on online courses, and you'll see it there. Sean is going to take you in, I think about eight weeks, through it. In fact, I'm going to teach one of the weeks there, as well, in this course called, Addressing Homosexuality with Clarity and Compassion. Nobody does it better than Sean McDowell. So, if you want to be part of the premium course, where you'll be live online with both Sean and myself, via zoom video, then you can just sign up soon. Because, as I say, it's going to be filling up quickly for the premium version. The self-paced version, the basic version, you can take whenever you want. It begins April 1, both of them do, but if you want to be part of the premium version, check that out.

All right, let's go back to some of your questions. Got a question from Taylor who writes this. He had been reading, *Stealing from God*, and, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. And in there I said, "You can't know something is wrong unless you know something is right". And he writes in and he says, "Can't we know that something, say a mathematical proof, is wrong, even if we don't know the right answer? For example, I don't know what 453,129,723 or some big long number times 259 equals, but I do know that zero is the wrong answer. Moreover, I know what many answers are, I know that they're wrong." This isn't worded properly here in the email. In any event. So, doesn't that kind of disprove my point? And my point is no, because every negation does imply an affirmation. So, when I say something is wrong, I have to have at least some idea of what is right in order to know that something is wrong.

And so, when you give the example here, Taylor that 453,000 times 259, you don't know what the answer is to it off top of your head. But you do have some idea of what it can't be because you know, basic mathematics. If you didn't know any mathematics, you wouldn't be able to make any kind of claim here. But since you know basic mathematics, you know several numbers, most numbers are wrong. So, to negate a particular value for this answer, you would have to have at least some idea, some affirmation of how math works. So, the point still holds.

Now, I don't have to know the exact correct answer. But I have to know enough to say whether the answer being provided can't be correct. And so, if you say, "Zero", for this big long a product, I'm going to say, "Yeah, you're right". It can't be zero. It can't be one, it can't be two, it can't be anything less than a whole bunch of numbers, obviously. But that still implies I do know something positive in order to even make that claim. So, the claim, every negation implies an affirmation, still stands.

**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**

All right, Mike writes in. He says, "If God is omnipresent, then he is also president hell. But if he's not in hell, how do we accept the biblical explanation that hell is a place absent of God?" In other words, if God is omnipresent, and hell is separation from God, how can God both be omnipresent, and hell still be separation from God? And Mark asks a similar question where he says, "I know the answer, but how can an omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent God be separated from a non-believer for eternity? Where can that non-believer be where God is not? Having a hard time wrapping my head around it."

All right, let's go to the passage that talks about hell being separation from God. This is 2 Thessalonians chapter one, beginning in verse six. And the context of the passage is... remember, there are no verses in the Bible. The context of the passages is that the church in this area has been experiencing suffering. So, here's what Paul says. "God is just. He will pay back trouble to those who trouble you." I guess they're being persecuted, so he's saying, Look, don't worry about it. Eventually there's going to be justice done..."and give you relief to you who are troubled, and to us as well. This will happen when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven in blazing fire with his powerful angels. He will punish those who do not know God and do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus." Now, here's verse nine. Here's what it says. "They will be punished with everlasting destruction and shut out from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His might."

Now, this is implying here that hell is separation from God, but if God is everywhere, how can he be separated from everyone? Well, let's put it this way. When we say God is everywhere, we don't mean that God is physically everywhere. God is not a spatial being, but since we are spatial beings, he explains himself spatially. God is present to all things. God's power is present everywhere, but his essence is immaterial, and spaceless. So, it's a category mistake and logic to say that an immaterial and spaceless being is in time and space. If he's immaterial, and spaceless, then he's not in time and space in his essence, but in his power he is. He's holding everything together. Just like he's holding this computer in front of me together right now. But he's not this computer. His power is present to this computer, but he's not this computer. To say that this computer is God is pantheism. So, God's power is present to this computer, in the sense that he's holding it together. He's holding the natural forces which hold it together. But God is not this computer. He is present to all things but he's not in all things.

When we say God is in you, that's a relational term. When you've accepted Christ, God is in you, he sealed you with His Holy Spirit, Ephesians one. But that doesn't mean if we were to cut you open, we find God inside of you. God is present to you relationally, but he's not inside of you. He's an immaterial and spaceless being. So, is God present in hell?

**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**

Well, before I get there, let's point out something Aquinas pointed out. Aquinas says that we can only talk about God analogously, not univocally. What do we mean by this kind of language? Something that univocal has exactly the same meaning. So, if I say the bark of a tree, that would be the same meaning if I said, it's the bark of an oak tree, and the bark of another tree. I'm talking about bark in the same sense. But if I say, the bark of a dog, that's a different sense of the word bark. It's not the same meaning.

Equivocal means an entirely different meaning. And analogous means the similar meaning. So, if we say that God is all-knowing, that means that God has all knowledge, but he doesn't have it in the same way we have it. We have knowledge. God is knowledge. And when we say that God is say, for example, personal. Yes, he's personal, and we're persons like God, but not in exactly the same way. Not in a univocal way, exactly the same meaning. Not an equivocal way, a completely different meaning. But an analogous way. We're made in God's image. That means that we're persons like God, we have mind emotion and will, and we can create, and we can rule like God. But we're made in His image in an analogous way, not in a literal one to one relationship way. So, when we say that God's power is present everywhere, because his power holds all things together, and he causes them continually, this is using analogous language. It's not using univocal language. I know this is getting a little bit technical here.

Let me just continue with what this question is asking. When we say that God's love is in the afterlife, it's experienced only by those who are open to accepting it. Yes, God's love is in hell, but it's not accepted by those in hell. There's weeping and gnashing of teeth in hell, against God. Here's an example that my mentor Dr. Norman Geisler used. If you've ever been to Niagara Falls. You know, you go to Niagara Falls. And if you go in the tunnel underneath Niagara Falls, you can actually put your hand in the falls. Imagine you had a cup, and you took your cup and you put it right into the falls. Obviously, it would fill up instantly. But imagine if you took the same cup and you turned it upside down, and you put it into the falls. You'd get no water in it.

Well, that's kind of the same way that God's presence is experienced, this is an analogy, obviously, but God's presence is experienced in heaven and hell. In heaven, your cup is up, and God fills your cup. In hell, your cup, by your own choice is turned over. So, while God is there, you don't experience the goodness of God. You experience the justice of God, but not the goodness. So, you'll get no water in it if you have it turned upside down. You get water in it if you have it turned right side up, like you'll have it in heaven. Your cup will be turned up, so you'll experience God's love. But if you have your cup turned against God in hell, while his

**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**

power is still present in hell, you don't experience His love. Because you are not open to his love.

As CS Lewis famously put it, and he's speaking here of people here on Earth, but I think it applies afterwards. He says, "God shows much more of himself to some people than to others. Not because he has favorites, but because it is impossible for him to show himself to a man whose whole mind and character are in the wrong condition. Just as sunlight, though it has no favorites, cannot be reflected in a dusty mirror, as clearly as in a clean one." That's from CS Lewis, of course, *Mere Christianity*. Yes, God is present everywhere, but not everybody is open to the love of God. And so, he's present in hell, but you're still separated from God's love, because you have chosen to turn your cup upside down against him, to weep and gnash your teeth against him.

All right friends, don't forget I'm going to be throughout Nebraska, Lord willing. this week. I'm going to be at Kearney eFree church on Sunday, and then the University of Nebraska at Kearney Monday night, Tuesday night at the University of Nebraska Lincoln, and then Wednesday night Omaha. And all that will be streamed on our website and our Facebook page. So, see you there. God bless. See you next time.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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