

## Philosophy is More Certain Than Science

(April 24, 2020)

Is morality more certain than science? Or is science more certain than morality? Is philosophy more certain than science? Or is science more certain than philosophy? You probably say, oh, science is far more certain than those two things. Hold on, we'll get to it. Why would God put Adam and Eve in the Garden if he knew they would sin? And are we just here for God's Glory has got some cosmic ego? Those are some of the questions I hope to get to today.

You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Website [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). That's CrossExamined with a D on the end of it.org.

Question. Why is the country locked down? Why are you sitting at home? I submit to you it's because we know more about the morality of the coronavirus than the science of the coronavirus. Morality is the reason you're sitting home right now. We know it's wrong to allow a virus to indiscriminately kill innocent people when we can prevent it. Problem is, is that we really don't know how to prevent it and we don't really know how dangerous it is. We know it's dangerous, to a certain extent. Many people have died, but we don't really have the specifics.

In fact, our scientific uncertainty made us assume that the worst case models were true. When this whole thing started, we were at 2.5 million deaths, based on the models. Then we said, okay, if we do social distancing, we lock down the country, anywhere between 100,000 - 240,000 would die. In fact, Dr. Burks, on March 29, at the White House Conference, at the press conference said, if we do everything perfectly, we might be at the lower end of that range, 100,000 - 240,000. Well, it looks like that we're going to be well under that, thankfully.

So, why weren't the models better? Why didn't they give us better data? Because we didn't have enough data going in. If we knew the science better, the entire nation would probably not be in lockdown. Manhattan might be but not Montana. See, we know the morality better. We're more certain that it's wrong to allow innocent people to die, when you can prevent it,

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

than we are about what actually makes innocent people die, and how it how it spreads, and how dangerous it is. Because, look, all the assumptions that went into these models, the transmission rates, we don't we don't really know what they are. The transmission rate seems to be higher than the flu because we don't have any antibodies for the coronavirus. At least when this whole thing started. We do now. We don't really know how contagious it is. It's obviously contagious to a to a relatively high degree. We just don't know how much. And so, the models had to guess. We don't know the number who are asymptomatic.

Although in recent days, we've discovered, it seems, both from data from California, and data from New York, that a lot more people have this than we originally thought. Maybe by an order of magnitude of between 50 and 85. In other words, 50-85 times more people have this than we think. Which means what? Well, it means that most of the people who get this have either no symptoms or mild symptoms. And that means the death rate of the coronavirus is much less than we think. Doesn't mean it's not dangerous, but it's less than we originally thought. Let me put it that way.

And so, I asked Dr. Dan, who we've had on this program several times, as you know, the medical doctor, about this. I said, as one commentator, after he ran the numbers said the death rate was about 0.75%. I asked Dr. Dan, so if the death rate is really 0.75%, and much less for younger, and those without other conditions, we should open everything up and continue to practice social distancing while isolating the vulnerable. He said, exactly. Because the real way to end this, now that we have more data, is to allow healthy people to get it, who will turn out to be either asymptomatic or not experience great trouble from this. They'll have mild symptoms. And sequester or protect the vulnerable.

What happens when you do that? You get what's called herd immunity. The virus actually doesn't go anywhere after that, because there's no place for it to go. Or, there's fewer people for it to go to. And so, the epidemic, or the pandemic ceases. That's the way you protect people. In fact, Dr. Dan was saying, if you really want to end this, more people need to get infected who are healthy, who will then develop antibodies. And that will prevent the virus from continuing to grow. And we don't know that number right now. We don't know how many are already immune. We're trying to figure that out. But if this data that has recently come in this week, or has come in this week, is correct, then that's probably what we ought to do.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Now, we didn't know this in retrospect. Why? Because we didn't know the science. We didn't have enough data. We knew the morality better than the science. We don't know the cause of death for many people. They've moved the goalposts this week. They started adding probable coronavirus death to the total number. They said, let's just count the probable ones now. So, they've actually inflated the number dead by just changing the criteria. Now again, this isn't to minimize it. It's tragic when you have 50,000 people die. I'm not saying that's not tragic. I'm simply saying that we're changing the way we're counting because our science is not very precise.

We don't know the number who would have died anyway, from other diseases. You see people dying from coronavirus. They're 90 something years old Well, is it really coronavirus that killed them? Might these people have died anyway? It depends on how it's being reported. Dr. Burke said, we're going to count everybody who has coronavirus as being the cause of death, despite the fact that somebody who might have had coronavirus virus also had a heart attack that killed him. We're gonna say that's a coronavirus death. Well, if we're imprecise in how we count people, and we keep changing the criteria by which we count people, how does that help our scientific understanding? There are many things we don't know. We don't know how easily it transmits via the air. We don't know the impact of warmer weather. We assume, if it's like other coronaviruses, the warmer weather is going to make it much less prevalent. We don't know all these things. We're getting better data now. And maybe we can make better assessments now. But without the data, we can't know. And so, what the President, and others decided to do was, let's go with the worst case scenario and lock everything down. Because we're more sure of the morality than we are of the science.

Now one other observation about this morality issue, ladies and gentlemen Do you know that there is nobody out there, no atheist out there, thankfully, and certainly no Christian out there, who was saying, you know what, let's just let this thing go. Let's just use the Darwinian survival of the fittest morality. Why don't we just let people who are vulnerable get it. They'll die and that'll be better for the remaining people. This is survival of the fittest, anyway. Right? Now, despite the fact that somebody like Richard Dawkins, who on one hand says, there is no right and wrong, there is no good, there is no justice, there is no ultimate good or evil, we just dance to our DNA. Despite the fact that he says that as an atheist, he says, to his credit, I don't believe

**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 Darwinian type morality. I don't believe in the survival of the fittest. So, on one hand, he claims to be an atheist in his academic work. But practically, he's gonna have to say, no, I don't want to buy into that either. I don't want to buy into the implications of a Darwinist morality. I'm going to say that no, we ought to protect people.

Well, why should we protect people? By what moral standards should we protect people? Because Richard Dawkins knows as much as everybody else, that it's wrong to allow innocent people to die. He knows that, but he can't justify that by his worldview. Thankfully, we're not suggesting that Darwinian morality should go through. But if you try and live out atheism consistently, you'd have to say, well, that's just the way things are. There is no right or wrong. Let's just let people die. There would be nothing wrong with that. They know there's something wrong with it, but it doesn't comport with their atheism.

We're gonna unpack more of this right after the break. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek and the American Family Radio Network. Our website is [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). We're back in two minutes.

Friends, can you help me with something? Can you go up to iTunes, or wherever you listen to this podcast, and give us a five-star review? Why? It will help more people see this podcast and therefore then hear it. So, if you could help us out there, I'd greatly appreciate it.

You know, one thing I haven't mentioned lately, and I ought to is, we've got the CrossExamined Instructor Academy coming up this summer. It's still scheduled. We're not canceling it. It's in Dallas. CIA is in Dallas. I want to say it's August 6-8. Have to look at the calendar, but around there, early August. And the reason we're doing it in Dallas, because, look, no virus can survive in Dallas in August. In fact, human beings can hardly survive in Dallas in August. Okay. So, that's where we're holding it. No, we didn't know about the virus and we scheduled it, but that's where we're holding it. Myself, Greg Koukl, J. Warner Wallace, David Wood, Richard Howe, Bobby Conway, Alisa Childers, Brett Kunkle, are going to be there to help you become a better apologist. To help you better be able to defend your faith in a presentation format, in a Q&A format. And so, if you want to be a part of CIA, we take only about 60 people. It's a three day, intimate group, where you get to learn from the people that you see out there doing it. People I just mentioned, personally. You're going to present to us and we're gonna evaluate how you

**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

present. We will, of course, present to you as well. So, check out CIA. Go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org), click on events. You'll see CIA there and apply. You have to apply soon. It's not inexpensive, but it's well worth it. In fact, we have people who have come to CIA like eight times. This is going to be our 13th event, or 13th year of doing it. So, if you want to be a part of that you better apply quickly, because we're going to run out of room.

Alright now, you're probably thinking Frank, are you really going to suggest that science is less certain than philosophy? That science is less certain than morality? Yes. Why? Why do you say that philosophy is more certain, or at least as certain as science? Because you can't do science without philosophy. Science is built on philosophy. A building is only as strong as its foundation. And if the foundation is weak, then the building is weak. It will tumble. In fact, let's just think about some of the sentences, or some of the claims made about science. Science will save us, people will say. Well, that actually is a philosophical statement about science. It's not science itself. You can't prove that in the laboratory. Science will save us. No. That's a philosophical statement about science. You have to use philosophy to come up with that. Whether it's true or not is another question. But it's a philosophical statement.

Science is more valuable than religion. Well, that's actually a value statement about science. It's not science itself. Again, you have to use philosophy and value itself, or you have to make some sort of moral judgment in order to come to that conclusion. You're using morality. You're using philosophy in order to make statements like that. All truth comes from science. I'm sure, you've heard that as well. Well, all truth comes from science, is actually a self-defeating statement about science, because number one, you can't get that science from the laboratory, or that statement, or that conclusion from the laboratory. That's a philosophical statement. And number two, it defeats itself. It's a claim about science. It's not science itself. To say all truth comes from science is not a scientific claim. And for it to be true, if it has to be a scientific claim, that statement isn't true then. I know it can give you intellectual constipation if you think about it. Let me say it another way. All truth comes from science, is not a truth claim from science. It's a truth claim about science that comes from philosophy. So, science is built on philosophy. And again, any building can only be as sure as its foundation.

What is the foundation of science? I'm gonna list nine philosophical assumptions that scientists make in order to do science. Without them you can't do science, or you can't get accurate

**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

results. Number one, truth exists, and it can be known. That's a philosophical claim. It's not a claim by science, it's a claim you need to believe in order to do science. Because if truth doesn't exist, or you can't know truth, why you trying to do a scientific experiment, or scientific investigation, to discover the truth? That would make no sense. That's the first philosophical assumption you're making.

Number two; the laws of nature are orderly and consistent. That's a philosophical assumption. It's built on observation, which assumes a certain amount of philosophy in order to do, and it presupposes that there should be somebody out there who created these laws of nature and keeps them so orderly and consistent. I mean, that's where order comes from. It comes from an orderer. Where do the laws of nature come from? Scientists just grant themselves the laws of nature. I'm reminded of Paul Davies, who many years ago had an editorial in the New York Times, and he's an agnostic. He's not a Christian. He's an agnostic astronomer, I think from Arizona State University. The title of the op-ed, if I remember correctly, was Taking Science on Faith. And his point was, is that scientists are just saying the laws of nature just exist. And they had no origin. They're just there. There's no cause for these laws. We're just starting with these laws. Where do those laws come from? And why are they so orderly and consistent? Every material thing changes. Why do the laws of nature, which govern material things, why don't they change? And if they do change, how could we do science? I mean, if a certain cause causes a particular effect today, what happens if the laws of nature change? Are we going to be able to get that same cause and effect relationship, or recognize that same cause and effect relationship tomorrow? Well, no, I guess if the laws of nature change.

The third assumption you're making is that all effects have causes. The law of causality. You can't prove that by science. You need that in order to do science. That's what scientists do. They're trying to discover what particular cause caused a particular effect. And that's what theologians do too, which theology traditionally has been called the queen of all sciences. Because you're taking all of reality and you're trying to discover what is the cause of all of reality, and every aspect, every academic discipline under this umbrella of reality, and how it all fits together toward one overarching truth. All effects have causes. And as a theologian sees an effect, like the universe, and they reason back to a cause. If there's a creation, that's the effect, they reason back to a cause, a creator. They see design in the universe. That's the effect. They reason back to a cause, a designer. They see a moral law, or sense a moral law written on our

**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

hearts, they reason back to a moral lawgiver. They're reasoning from effect to cause. That's what scientists do, whether they're natural scientists, or whether they're scientists, which means knowledge.

That's what you're trying to do when you're doing science. You're trying to discover knowledge. Whether they're theologians, whether they're archaeologists, whether they're anthropologists, or sociologists, or psychologists, or whoever they are. No matter what kind. Even historians are considered scientists. They're trying to discover truth. They're trying to discover knowledge. Causes have effects and effects have causes; the law of causality. You can't discover that by science, you have to assume that, in order to do science.

Number four; the fourth philosophical presupposition, or assumption you're making when you're doing science, is that causes in the past were like those in the present. This is called the Principle of Uniformity. And this says that if you find an effect today, that had a particular cause, that the same kind of cause must be responsible for that same effect, say 1000 years ago. So, if you come across the Rosetta Stone, in Egypt, and you see there's three kinds of languages engraved into this rock, and you say, well, what could it cause that? Well today you know that to put languages into rock, you got to have an intelligent being to do so. You got to have, you know, a mind to actually create. A human being to create those etchings in the rock. So, we're gonna say that because today it requires an intelligent being to create inscriptions in Iraq, the Rosetta Stone must have been created the same way. Because causes in the past were like those in the present. If we can't assume the principle of uniformity, we can't get out the past because we can't go back and witness the past directly. All we can do is look at the clues leftover and assume that the same kind of effect had the same type of cause back then, like it does now. Principle of Uniformity. Can't prove it by science. It's a philosophical presupposition.

Fifth assumption you're making when you're doing science. Our senses are giving us accurate information about the real world. That's called realism. Now, this should not happen on atheism. Why? Because if your mind doesn't really exist, you just have a brain, and your brain is controlled completely by the laws of physics, you shouldn't believe anything you think. You're just a moist robot, as I've said a million times on this show. Yet our senses can give us accurate information about the real world and our mind can know these things. That's an assumption that scientists make, they have to make. otherwise they can't do science. They can't get any

**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**

data for their experiments, or their historical investigation, without their senses. So, you have to assume your senses are reliable.

Number six; you have to assume that the immaterial laws of logic and mathematics apply to the material world. Why should they? Where did these immaterial laws come from? Years ago, Eugene Wigner had an article called, The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics. Why? Why can we describe external reality by mathematics? He didn't have any answer. He wasn't a theist. Well, the answer I think, is because God set up this orderly world based on his orderly nature. And so, mathematics does apply to the world, just like the laws of logic apply. That's better explained by theism than atheism. And you need those laws in order to do science. You can't prove them by science. You can't prove the laws of logic by putting them in a test tube. Or the laws of mathematics. You need those laws in order to do science. This is why philosophy is at least as certain, quite often more certain, than science itself. Because in order to do science, you need to use these assumptions, in order to actually come out with some sort of scientific result.

The seventh assumption; we have free will to make choices and to follow the evidence where it leads. Again, that shouldn't happen if we're molecular machines, if we're moist robots. But you have to have their free will to follow the evidence where it leads. If you're just a moist robot, if you're a molecular machine, a wet computer, so to speak, how can you follow the evidence where it leads? You're just molecules bumping into one another. But if you have freewill to say, ah, I see where the evidence is pointing. Let me make a freewill decision to say, that's the cause of this effect. Gotta have freewill. You can't prove it by science. You got to assume it in order to do science.

All right, you're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek. Much of what I'm talking about is in our book, Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case, if you want more details here. So, check that book out. And I'll be back in just two minutes and we'll continue. Don't go anywhere.

Friends, Frank Turek here. I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist is a listener supported radio program and podcast. So, if you like what you hear here, would you consider donating to

**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**

crossexamined.org? 100% of your donations go to ministry. Zero percent to buildings. We're completely virtual. So, if you can help us out, we greatly appreciate it. Thank you so much.

Today we're talking about why science depends on philosophy. And for that reason, philosophy is at least as certain, if not more certain, than science itself. And we've talked about a number of reasons why science is built on philosophy. We've given seven so far. Here's number eight. The eighth assumption we make when we're doing science is, that we can make rational inferences from the scientific data to establish true premises and then draw valid conclusions. When we're doing a scientific investigation, or an experiment, we're assuming that we can get good data from that and then apply that data to the real world, in other words. And make these valid conclusions. Why can we do that again? That's better explained by theism, an ultimate mind, than nothingness, or just molecules bumping into one another.

And then the ninth assumption we make when we're doing science, which can't be proven by science, but affects the outcome is, that we should report our results accurately. In other words, objective moral values and obligations exist. We ought to be honest, when we're doing science. You can't prove that by science you need to bring morality to science. You can't put morality in a test tube. You can't get morality from a test tube. You have to be moral in order to get the right results. Because if you fudge your data, or you fudge the results, because you want to get a certain result, you're gonna get, obviously, a bad scientific conclusion.

You see, science can tell you how to build a bomb, but science can't tell you whether or not you ought to use it. That's a moral question. Morality is more certain than the scientific result you're getting because you have to use morality in order to get the scientific result you're trying to get. It's at least as certain, if not more. In fact, you know, with more certainty, that torturing babies for fun is wrong, than your assessment of how electrons work. You're more certain about that. In fact, JP Moreland made that case on our show here last year, when he talked about his book on scientism. He says, there have been four different views of electrons in the past hundred years. You know how they actually work? Theories of electrons. He said, I can see us coming up with maybe a more precise theory of electrons 50 years from now. I can't see us changing our view, however on the question, is it right to torture babies for fun? We're all going to still know 50 years from now that torturing babies for fun is wrong. And even if we're brainwashed to believe otherwise, it would still be wrong to torture babies for fun. But, you

**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

know, we might change our scientific assessment of electrons because science is tentative. Morality, on the big issues, isn't. It's not tentative to say, you ought not murder people. It's not tentative to say, you ought not torture babies for fun. These are not tentative. It's not tentative that you ought not rape people. We know that. And any argument for atheism will be built on weaker premises than the moral intuitions that those things are wrong. That's what Louise Antony admitted. An atheist. She admitted in her debate with William Lane Craig.

And oh, by the way, did you see the show with William Lane Craig on Friday? The Hope One Show? Dr. Craig came on and I asked him a bunch of questions. He answered a bunch of questions. And you, the audience asked him a bunch of questions, as well. It's an hour long show. It's on our YouTube channel, [crossexamined.org](https://www.crossexamined.org). Also, our Facebook page. Share that with others. The Hope One Show we try and bring you every day at 11:30am, to bring you hope during this lockdown period. Hope you can join us. Scheduled for this week we've got people like, let's see, David Wood, J. Warner Wallace, Alisa Childers, Max McLean, others. Hope you can join us.

So, the point here is that we should report our results accurately. That's the ninth assumption we make. In order to do science, you can't prove this by science. You need those things in order to do science. So, scientists rely on all these truths, at all stages of the scientific process. Before, during, and after gathering data, or doing an experiment. All of these philosophical assumptions are taking place. And in order to interpret the data, that takes a mind, a freewill mind that can rationally follow the evidence where it leads. An honest mind that's not going to fudge the data. One study showed that at least a third of scientists that fudge data to get the results they want. A third. Now, those are just the people that admitted it. Maybe that's higher. Now I'm not trying to impugn all scientists. Don't get me wrong. I'm simply saying that scientists are just like everybody else. We're fallen creatures and we might be tempted to fudge data to get the result we want. To get the grant money we want, or to get the result we want for our particular client, or because we have an ideological bias.

So, philosophy is more certain than science. If it wasn't, you wouldn't be sitting home right now. Because as we learn more and more about the coronavirus, as deadly as it is, it's not deadly to everyone. A more reasonable approach, if we had the data, would probably be the one that I mentioned earlier. That we would protect the vulnerable people, sequester them,

**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 the people that were healthy and didn't have other pre-existing conditions, could with social distancing, go out there and resume their normal duties and not shut down the entire economy. Which, by the way, will kill a lot of people, now that we've done that. We've been through that on this program before, but you're killing people no matter what you do. If you open up the society, you're probably going to kill people from coronavirus. If you don't open the society, you're going to kill people, because you haven't opened up society. The question is how do you minimize the death? That's a political question. Maybe we'll talk about it again at another time.

But the point here is, is that you're more certain about philosophical issues and moral issues, which is a philosophical issue, than you are scientific issues, in many cases. And science can never be more certain than philosophy because it's built on philosophy. If your philosophical presuppositions, or your philosophical assumptions, or your philosophical conclusions are weak, and they go into your scientific experiment, then you're not going to get the right result. So, I just thought I'd point that out. Because we're so often told that science is the savior to everything, when in fact, science couldn't even get off the ground without philosophy, without morality. These are things you have to bring to science without logic, without math, in order do science.

Now let's deal with some other questions. You guys have sent questions in and we've kind of been talking about other issues. So, I apologize I haven't gotten to some of your questions. If you have a question, you can email it to [hello@crossexamined.org](mailto:hello@crossexamined.org). Pam writes in and says, "My question is, if God knew that Adam and Eve were going to sin, and he was going to send Jesus to die for us and save us"...the question is, if he knew, and he was going to say, it's not worded right, sorry. Anyway, I'm sure he did know Adam and Eve were going to eat of that tree. Why did he put us here as sinners, even as believers in him, when he knew we were going to hurt each other? Why did he do that? Why did he allow...if he knew they were going to sin, why did he even put them in the garden? Why did he even give them the opportunity?

Because if he didn't give us the opportunity to make a freewill choice, we couldn't love. If we never have an opportunity to make a freewill choice, then we can't love people either. Love requires freewill. The problem is, freewill opens up the possibility for evil. And that's why God

**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

had to come into the universe. That's why Jesus had to come in to save us from the evil that we did. Because he's an infinitely just being. He can't allow sin to go on punished, he's got to punish it. So, who does he punish? He doesn't punish us in eternity, if we're covered with Christ's sacrifice. He punishes Christ in our place. That way he remains just, and he also justifies the ungodly, which is, that's me and you. We're ungodly.

So, you could ask that same question. Why did God put me on the earth if he knew I was going to sin? Why did God put you on the earth if he knew you were going to sin? Because if he wants to have love, He's got to allow freewill. And he knew he could redeem it. Now, is it possible God could have created a universe where nobody sinned? Well, that's logically possible, but it might not be actually achievable with free creatures. Because as soon as you allow freedom, by definition, you can't force free creatures to do what you want them to do. If you did, they wouldn't be free. So, while this isn't the best way, or I should say it another way, why this isn't the best possible world...because, you know, one less rape, one less murder, one less coronavirus death would make it a better world, it might be the best way to get to the best possible world with free creatures. God gives us freewill to love or to not love. And he redeems those who know they've fallen short and who want forgiveness. But he can't force free people to love him. Love, by definition, must be freely given, so he can't force people to love him. All they can do is offer his love and offer his sacrifice. So, it's a good question, Pam. But if he didn't give them any freewill, and he didn't give us freewill, we wouldn't be free creatures, and this wouldn't be a moral universe.

Another question. This comes from David Kushner. David says, "I grew up Christian, but I never knew who Jesus was until the last few months. The reason I began to know Jesus, is because I started doubting by thinking, is God actually real? I did a lot of research and I got some pretty good answers now. But I still tend to doubt God at moments, and this puts me in fear. I wish I could just know that he's there. In my heart, I always say that I know God exists. But I still have doubts. Any advice would you mean would mean everything to me."

Well, first of all, one of the problems here, David, and everyone struggles on occasion with this. is the fact that your psychology will not tell you whether or not something is true. Whether or not God exists or anything else is true. The evidence will. Your psychology can change. You know, you could wake up one day feeling great. Everything's fine. The next day you wake 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 you go, oh gee, I doubt all this. Well, what changed? Did the evidence change? No, the evidence didn't change. You changed. You're going up, you're going down. If you saw Greg Koukl on our Thursday, Hope One, he says this. Before I have my first cup of coffee in the morning, I'm an atheist. After I have my first cup, I'm a Jehovah's Witness. By the time I have my second cup, I'm back to being a Christian. Well notice. What's changing? Him or the evidence? He's changing. He's going up and down based on whether or not he's got caffeine. Okay, and it's a joke, but you get the idea, right? Your psychology will not tell you whether or not Christianity is true, or anything's true. The evidence will.

You know, a lot of people are definitely afraid of flying, but I submit to you from the evidence, it's the safest way to go anywhere. Thousands of flights every day. Very rarely do you have an accident. Very rarely. You're more at risk getting into a car, yet the same people who fear flying, are the same people who drive all over the place. It's not rational. It's emotional. And airline travel is still the safest way to go, despite the fact you might not actually feel it. Same thing is true with God. God actually exists even if psychologically you doubt he exists. And how do you know he exists? We'll get into some of that right after the break.

You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek and the American Family Radio Network. Website again is [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). Don't forget about CIA, CrossExamined Instructor Academy and the new, Stealing from God course, we're going to teach next month. I'll tell you more about that in a minute.

Hi friends, Frank Turek. You can only have two things. Either you can have hope, or you can have despair. Every day during this coronavirus season, at 11:30am (ET) / 10:30am (CT), we will be live online with a new live stream called, Hope One. It's at [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). Go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org) and we're going to give you hope every weekday, Monday through Friday, 11:30am (ET) / 10:30am (CT). I hope you can join us.

That's right. I'll be teaching, Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case, online beginning in May. All the details on our website, [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org) Click on online courses. If you take the premium version, I'll be online live with you on seven occasions, taking your questions via zoom video. And we've been doing a lot of that over this lockdown month. We were running, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, and, Fearless Faith. And Sean

**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**

McDowell is teaching a course on Homosexuality in the Bible, right now. And so, we're doing a lot of zoom sessions. We might as well make this time productive, ladies and gentlemen, while we're sitting all at home. And next month, we'll teach, Stealing from God. So, if you want to be a part of that, go to [crossexamined.org](http://crossexamined.org). Click on online courses.

And I'll get back to David's question here in a minute, but I thought of something else with Pam. Pam was asking the question, you know, why did God create Adam and Eve knowing they would sin? Put them in the garden? Well, we could ask that same question about us. Why do we as parents have kids knowing they will sin? Because we know that, despite the fact that our kids are going to do evil, they can still do good. And if God exists, he can redeem their choices, as well. He can save them, as well. So, we realize that, despite the fact that opening up the possibility for evil through freewill can bring pain and suffering, there's a greater good involved here. And that is love.

Anyway, back to David's question. He says, "I still have doubts". Sometimes I have people email me and they say, Frank, I used to be a Christian, or they'll see me on a college campus. Used to be a Christian, but you know, I'm an atheist now, because I lost my faith. And I almost want to say to them, so because your psychology changed, are you telling me God no longer exists? Or Jesus didn't rise from the dead? Your psychology does not affect whether or not God exists, or Jesus rose from the dead. He exists, or doesn't exist, regardless of what you think about it. Jesus rose from the dead, or he didn't rise from the dead, regardless of what you think about it. Your psychology is not the determining factor as to whether or not these things are true. The evidence is. So, you got to look at the evidence and discover if the evidence is good. And there is evidence, as we've been through 1000 times here. In fact, when atheists say there is no evidence, I always ask them well, why is there evidence for anything? I mean, you're living in a world that has evidence, and we can discover evidence, because this world is built by a rational mind and maintained by rational mind. If there was no source of rationality, if there was no order to this universe, there'd be no evidence for anything, much less God.

And by the way, if you're if you're feeling far from God, you know you're doubting, or you're doubting because of evil or suffering or whatever. Look, we have independent reasons to believe God exists. Therefore, even if some issues related to the problem of either, whether it's suffering, whether it's dryness, not feeling God is there, whatever it is, even if we can't answer

**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 of those questions precisely, or we just don't have enough information because we're finite, God's infinite, that's no reason to doubt God's existence. In other words, even if some of our questions aren't answered, or are inexplicable, because of our limited perspective, that's no reason to doubt God's existence. What we don't know does not negate what we do know. Let me say that again, what we don't know does not negate what we do know.

What do we know? We know God exists because of the cosmological argument. The universe had a beginning. Whatever created space, time, and matter can't be made of space, time, and matter. It must be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent. We talked about that. Dr. Craig talked about it on the one broadcast Friday. You can go there for more. We know there's got to be an incredible mind out there because of the teleological argument, from the fine tuning of the universe, including the initial conditions of the universe. The laws of nature, the constants and quantities in those laws of nature. The fact that the universe is goal directed. That things happen in an orderly way. That an acorn always becomes an oak tree. It doesn't become an elm tree, a birch tree, or a seahorse. Why? Because it's programmed to become an oak tree. And it doesn't have a mind of its own, yet it reliably goes in the direction of becoming an oak tree. Why? Well, if it doesn't have a mind of its own, there must be an external mind directing it toward an end.

This is what Aristotle called the unmoved mover. This is what Thomas Aquinas called God. And he said, this is my fifth way to argue for God. The entire universe is goal directed. It's going in a direction. It's not conscious, but if it's not conscious and it goes in a direction, there must be a conscious mind directing it. There are billions of letters of precisely ordered information in irreducibly complex creatures we call life. That's evidence for an intelligent being. There are transcendental arguments for God, like the laws of logic, and our ability to reason, and the laws of mathematics. Consciousness and freewill are best explained by a mind. The argument from composition shows that there must be an uncompleted composer.

Look, if things are composed and they are, everything that exists that we know about here on earth is composed. It's made of parts. Well, anything that's composed is put together by a composer, but you can't go on an infinite regress of composers. You got to get back to an uncompetitive composer. An uncreated being. A being that we would call the Great I Am. 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

being that just "be's". The being whose essence equals his existence. He's not composed. He simple. He has no parts. He's uncomposed and he's put everything that is composed together.

The argument from Old Testament prophecy. And of course, the New Testament and the resurrection. These are independent arguments that point to one ultimate cause. God. A spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, moral, intelligent creator who created and sustains all things. That being actually exists based on the evidence. Again, we're reasoning from effect back to cause and because you feel dry about it, or because your psychology changed, that doesn't change any of these arguments. In fact, for atheism to be true, for materialism to be true, every single spiritual experience in the history of the world has to be false. Is that possible? I suppose it's possible. Is it reasonable? No. Of course, not. Every single spiritual experience in the history of the world, every single miracle claim in the history of the world, has to be mistaken, has to be false. That takes a lot of faith to believe that. So, not knowing why God does certain things does nothing to defeat the solid arguments we already have for God's existence.

And in fact, one of the arguments we have for God's existence is evil itself. Not because God is doing evil, but because he's the standard of good by which we don't even know what evil was, as we've talked about before. So, if you think it's evil, that God doesn't reveal Himself to you more directly, or more persuasively, or in more ways, you're actually presupposing a standard, that this God ought to do this. Well, where are you getting this ought from?

Look, as I mentioned before, we know this is not the best of all possible worlds. One less rape, one less murder, one less death. But it is the best way to get to the best possible world. In fact, as Greg Koukl talked about, on his, in his book, *The Story of Reality*, and on Thursday's *Hope One Show*, that actually, the problem of evil is what Christianity is all about. If there was no problem of evil, there would be no need for Jesus. There would be no need for God to come into the bloodstream of humanity and to take our punishment on himself. Because if we hadn't done evil, if there was no evil that wouldn't be necessary. Christianity is the answer to the problem of evil.

So, this is the best way to get to the best possible world. And one of the things we're trying to do, the purpose of life is to know God and to make Him known. And when we say no, we don't

**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

just mean intellectually, we mean volitionally. To know him personally and to become more like him. And actually, sometimes that takes pain, as we've talked about before. You've got to go through difficulty in order to grow and become more like Jesus. Jesus learned obedience through suffering. A perfect man who had no sin nature learned obedience through suffering. Gee, that must mean we need a lot of suffering to learn obedience as well.

In fact, as Peter Craft has put it this way, which I think is a great quote, he said, "This world is a terrible resort. But it's a great gym." "This world is a terrible resort, but it's a great gym." You're working out and you're enhancing your capacity to enjoy God and one another by going through difficulty. That's what we're doing when we're going through difficulty. That's what we're doing. Those are the upsides, the positives that come out of difficulty. And without those positives, we might never discover why we're here. Or without those negatives, I should say, pain and suffering.

So, some people will never come to God, will never even think about God, until they're on their back. CS Lewis said, "Sometimes you only look up when you're on your back." Of course, there are other people, doesn't matter what God does. If things are going really well, they put God completely out of their mind. That's why I say prosperity is one of our greatest trials. Prosperity is one of our greatest trials. Because when things are going well, we tend to forget about God. This is why Jesus said it's difficult for rich man to get into heaven, because we tend to put all of our all of our security, and all of our worth, and all of our plans into prosperity. Prosperity can be a problem; it can divert us. And so, when things are going well, we forget about God.

Those same people, sometimes, if they have no interest in God, as soon as things start going badly, they blame God. Well, wait a minute. Okay, hold on. Hold on. Either God exists or he doesn't exist. If things are gonna go really well, and you're gonna forget about him, but only complain when things go really bad, do you really believe in him? I mean, come on. Do you really think that God's job is to make us happy and well here? Is that why we're here? Just to be happy and to feel good all the time? As CS Lewis famously said, he said, you know, "we just want God to be a benevolent old grandfatherly type figure who just wants everyone to have a good time." If that's your idea of God, you got the wrong God. God's a father, not a grandfather. He wants more for us than just to spoil us. He wants us to become like Him and enjoy him forever. And sometimes you got to go through difficulty in order to do that. So, if

**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

you're feeling a period of dryness, or you're feeling that God just isn't as close to you as you want, don't doubt that he exists. There's a lot of evidence he does exist, regardless of what your psychology says.

Alright, friends, great being with you again. I'm Frank Turek. Hope you can watch the Hope One broadcast this week. Hope to see you again here next week. I hope you have a wonderful weekend. Love one another this week. See ya.

If you benefit from this podcast, help others find it. Just go to iTunes, or any other podcast service you might be using, to listen and leave us a five-star rating on the, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast with Dr. Frank Turek. It will take you less than five seconds. You can also help a lot by leaving us a positive review for others to see. This podcast is available on iTunes, Spotify, Google Play Stitcher, TuneIn, and many other audio content delivery apps. Thank you and God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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