

Do Extraordinary Claims Require Extraordinary Evidence?

(February 13, 2021)

Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. You hear that claim a lot, especially when it comes to something like the resurrection. If you're going to believe in the resurrection, you need extraordinary evidence to believe that extraordinary claim. Is that really true? That's what we're going to tackle here today on I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. My name is Frank Turek. Let's deal with the slogan...it is a slogan...extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. The question is, is it true?

Well, what does extraordinary mean? Well, the dictionary definition means, beyond what is usual, ordinary, regular or established. Beyond what is usual, ordinary, regular or established. That's what people typically say. Well, let's look at it analytically. Do extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence? Or the claim, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence...seems to me that the claim could be self-defeating. Why? Because it's an extraordinary claim itself, right, to say that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.

Okay, what kind of evidence do you have for that claim? What kind of extraordinary evidence do you have for that claim? Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. And notice it's not a scientific claim, it's a philosophical claim. You can't prove that in the laboratory that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. You would have to say that that's a philosophical claim. And whether it's true or not depends on how you define the words extraordinary. What is an extraordinary claim? What is extraordinary evidence. How do you determine or how do you define the word extraordinary?

Here's what we did back in 2004 when Dr. Geisler and I wrote the book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. We have a little section on this, I'll read a short portion of that, on extraordinary evidence. It goes like this. Some skeptics might admit that the resurrection is possible, but they say it would require extraordinary evidence to believe it. That is, since the New Testament makes extraordinary claims such as miracles, we must have extraordinary evidence in order to believe those claims. And this objection seems reasonable until you ask:

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

What does extraordinary mean? If it means, beyond the natural, then the skeptic is asking the resurrection to be confirmed by another miracle. How could that work? In order to believe in the first miracle, the resurrection, the skeptic would need a second miracle to support it. He would then demand a third miracle to support the second and this could go on ad infinitum. So, by this criteria, the skeptic would never believe in the resurrection. Even if it really happened.

And friends, there's something wrong with a philosophy that tells you, or a slogan that tells you to, don't believe something even if it really happened. If extraordinary means repeatable, as in a laboratory, then no event from history can be believed because historical events cannot be repeated. The believability of historical events can only be confirmed by looking at the quality of the eyewitness evidence, and the nature of the forensic evidence, in light of the principles of causality and uniformity. These are principles that we define in the book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. Besides, atheists who demand repeatability for Biblical miracles are inconsistent, because they do not demand repeatability of historical miracles in which they believe; like the Big Bang, or spontaneous generation of the first life, or macro evolution of subsequent life forms.

And this is what I'm going to talk about more today on this program, that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. Atheists do not apply that to their own beliefs. Their own extraordinary claims, they do not demand extraordinary evidence for, and we'll get into it as the program unfolds. Okay? So, you can't repeat historical events. And if you're going to claim that any event from history, from the world, needs to be repeatable, and that's extraordinary evidence, then you can't believe anything from history. In fact, you shouldn't even believe in your own birth. Why? Because you can't repeat your own birth. It happened once. You can't repeat anything from history. It happened only once. Yet, we believe many things from history because we have good evidence for those claims. Some of the evidence we know ourselves, we were eyewitnesses to it.

Now, if extraordinary means more than usual, then that's exactly what we have to support the resurrection. We have more eyewitness documents and earlier documents for the resurrection than anything else from the ancient world. Moreover, these documents include more historical details, and figures that have been corroborated by more independent and external sources, than anything else from the ancient world. We also have more than usual circumstantial

**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**

evidence supporting the resurrection. And then, Dr. Geisler and I say this. Finally, the skeptics pre-supposition can be challenged. We don't need extraordinary evidence to believe something. Atheists affirm that from their own worldview. They believe in the Big Bang, not because they have extraordinary evidence for it, but because there is good evidence that the universe exploded into being out of nothing. And good evidence is all you need to believe something. However, atheists don't have even good evidence for some of their own precious beliefs.

And that's what we're going to unpack here today. Now, let me say about this, that this slogan, that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence, is a slogan about whether or not you should believe a claim. It's not a slogan about whether or not the claim is true. Something can be true if you have no evidence for it. Right? Of course, there are many things that we have no evidence for that might be true. Okay. And there is a difference, by the way, between proof and persuasion. You can prove something to someone, but they may not be persuaded by it. Persuasion might require being open to the claim to begin with, or it may have something to do with a person's psychology, or a person's current worldview, or a person's prior experience.

You can prove something, and they may not be persuaded by it. I can prove to you that there are two genders, there's a male and a female gender, and yet many people today are not persuaded by that. I can prove to you that an unborn child is a human being. I can prove it genetically. I can show you pictures in the womb. I can show you body parts that are pulled out of a uterus; an aborted baby has body parts. I can prove all that to you, but you might not be persuaded by it, because you may not want to be persuaded by it. Because sometimes, in fact, this is true for all of us. Sometimes we don't want to be confused by the facts. Sometimes, we'd rather believe what we want to believe, rather than what is really true.

I'm reminded what Pascal said. He said, "people almost invariably base their beliefs, not on the basis of proof, but on the basis of what they find attractive. They may want Jesus to stay in the tomb because, if Jesus comes out of the tomb to prove he's God, then, uh oh, I have to follow Jesus. I don't want to follow Jesus I want to do my own thing. I don't want there to be an authority figure outside of my own desires, or outside of me. I want my own will to be done. I don't want God's will to be done, I want to do my own thing. You see, many people are not on a

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

truth quest, they're on a happiness quest, and they're just going to believe whatever they think is gonna make them happy.

So, there's a difference between proof and persuasion. You can prove something to someone, depending on how you define proof, but people may not be persuaded by it. And there's a difference between good evidence and compelling evidence. In fact, I would argue that there's no such thing as compelling evidence. You don't have to be compelled by anything if you don't want to. You know, you have freewill, you can suppress the truth. As Paul says in Romans chapter one, you can grieve the Holy Spirit, as happened in the book of Acts. You can do your own thing. You don't have to be compelled by any evidence.

This is why, when people say, well, if Christianity is true, why aren't more people Christians? Because they don't want to be. They're not even looking at the evidence. And there's good evidence out there. They want to do their own thing. And maybe it's us. Maybe we're believing what we want to believe, not because there's evidence for it, because we want to believe it. We got to check that out to. You see, the easiest person to fool can be yourself. You got to be aware of that as well.

By the way, why is there evidence at all? Let's dive into that 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. 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.

Many people have heard about what has happened at Ravi Zacharias International Ministries, particularly Ravi and the terrible scandal, the terrible behavior he apparently engaged in that nobody knew about until pretty much after he died. I haven't read the report yet. I know many people are interested in what many people who knew Ravi thought about this or think about this now. I think we're probably going to talk about this on the next podcast, because I haven't had an opportunity yet to read the report. It just came out yesterday and I'm recording this on Friday, February 12. Lincoln's birthday, by the way. Also, Darwin's birthday. Interesting.

**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**

Christopher Hitchens famously said, "who was the greater emancipator? Was it Lincoln or Darwin?" He thought it was Darwin because Darwin gave people the ability to, in his view, be an intellectually fulfilled atheist. That was actually Dawkins who said that, but that's a whole other subject.

I will talk about the Ravi Zacharias situation on the podcast after I've had an opportunity to read the report. I do not feel compelled to have an opinion on something that I don't have the facts for. And so, I haven't mentioned anything about it to this point. But we will after I have an opportunity to look at that report. I also want to talk to my friends who work at Ravi Zacharias International Ministries. I think that's only fair. I've spoken to one of them already, before I have any public comments on it. So, that's what I will do in the next podcast or two. So, keep alert for that.

Also, I want to mentioned that my friend, J. Warner Wallace, this week is starting his Cold Case Christianity online course for the first time ever, at CrossExamined.org. Click on online courses, you'll see it there. If you want to be with Jim on zoom live, to ask him questions, then you got to sign up for the premium version of the course. And we limit the number of people in the premium version, so you'll have an opportunity to ask him a question directly via zoom video. You need to sign up immediately. It starts this Monday, the 15th of February. Now, if you're listening to this a few days after that, you can still sign up for the course and the premium version. You can always sign up for the self-paced course, but you don't get Jim live on the zooms in the self-paced course. So, check that out. Cold Case Christianity begins this Monday, February 15.

Alright, let's go back to our topic, Extraordinary Claims Require Extraordinary Evidence. That is the claim that atheists make. And let me point this out That when you are looking at a particular event, or you know, an event from history...that's what we're looking at right now...or current evidence, I should say, that God exists, you don't just have to look at the evidence for God, But you also have to, you have to examine the probability that we would have this evidence for God if God did not exist. In other words, look at it from the other angle. Would we have the cosmological argument, the teleological argument, the moral argument, the transcendental argument, if God did not exist? Would these arguments, would this

**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**

evidence exist if there was no God? And what is the probability that we would have this evidence if Jesus did not rise from the dead?

What evidence do we have that Jesus rose from the dead? I go through it quite frequently when we go to a college campus. We have early evidence, we have eyewitness evidence, we have embarrassing details that they never would have made up, we have excruciating evidence...you know that they went and died for it when they could have saved themselves by saying it never happened. We have imbedded confirmation that deals with something called, undesigned coincidences, that don't appear to have been, or could have been invented. If the people that wrote down the New Testament documents were not independently witnessing the same events, there's no way to explain undesigned coincidences unless they were witnessing the same historical events. We have expected testimony that deals with Old Testament prophecy. We have extra-biblical writers writing about Jesus. Well, why would they be writing about Jesus if something phenomenal didn't happen with Jesus? I mean, you probably never would have heard of Jesus if he hadn't resurrected from the dead.

Also, the explosive growth of the church out of Jerusalem, how could this happen...coming from a place where the empty tomb was known by the Jews and the Romans, who could have gone to that tomb, if it wasn't empty, taken out the body and stopped Christianity right then and there. How could this have happened if Jesus hadn't risen from the dead? In other words, why would we have this evidence written by Jews in the first century, who didn't believe that a man could be God, who didn't believe...they thought it was blasphemy...who didn't believe in a resurrection in the middle of time. They believed in a resurrection at the end of time [Daniel 12], but they didn't believe that a man would resurrect in the middle of time. And you know, until the end of time, they didn't think there would be a resurrection.

And then why would they write all this down? They were Jews. They were followers of Yahweh. Why would we have all this if Jesus did not rise from the dead? Seems to me it takes more faith to believe Jesus didn't rise from the dead than to believe he did. Seems to me it takes more faith to believe God does not exist, given all the evidence we have that it does. And I'm using faith there in the way that atheists often use it, not the biblical definition. Atheists often say faith is believing something for which you have no evidence. Well, I think it's the atheists that

**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**

have to have more faith. That's why the name of the book is, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, using their definition.

And by the way, when we use these words like probability, what is the probability we would have this evidence if God did not exist? That word, probability, itself implies mathematics, it implies order, which also then implies a mind. I've mentioned before that the only atheist I know of whom I've ever debated, and I've had about 10 debates...most of them you can see on our YouTube channel, two words, Cross Examined. You can see all these debates there. The only the only atheist that I know about who ever read anything I wrote before the debate was Jeffrey Louder. Jeffrey, who started the Internet Infidels back in like 1995, he's the only one I know of that actually took the argument seriously, read the arguments, and then tried to deal with them. Hitchens didn't do that. Shermer didn't do that. David Silverman didn't do that. Eddie Tabash didn't do that. None of the atheists that I've debated did that except Jeffrey Louder, who by the way, his full time job is not to be an author or professional atheist, so to speak, where he goes around and speaks about atheism. He's a tech guy that works in the Seattle area. We keep in touch. Nice Guy, Jeffrey.

Anyway, in the debate that he and I had, which again, you can see on YouTube, he kept talking about probability theory; probability this, probability that. Well, probability itself, and probability theory, implies that the world is orderly and responds, or can be described by mathematics and can be described by order. Well, what's the best explanation for that? It seems to be a mind. But here's the real problem I have with the claim, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence, particularly when it comes from atheists. My question to them is this. Do you apply, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence, to your own extraordinary claims? Do you have, in other words, extraordinary evidence for your atheistic claims, which are extraordinary?

What do I mean by that? Well, let's take the cosmological argument for God....we've talked about it many times on this program...and that is the fact that space, matter and time had a beginning out of nothing. Even the atheists are admitting this. Stephen Hawking, probably the top atheist in the world until he died a few years ago said, almost everyone now believes that space, matter and time had a beginning at the Big Bang. Almost everyone believes that. Even atheists believe. Well, if space, matter, and time had a beginning at the Big Bang, it seems 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**

me that whatever created space, matter and time can't be made of space, matter and time. In other words, the cause must be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful to create the universe out of nothing. Personal in order to choose to create. Why do I say personal? Because to go from a state of nothingness, to a state of a creation, someone had to make a choice.

I mean, if there was nothing at one point, there would still be nothing today, unless there is a mind that brought it into existence, a powerful mind that brought it into existence. And when we say nothing, what we mean is no thing, no space, no matter, no time. We're not saying that God didn't exist. We're saying that the space time continuum didn't exist. If the space time continuum didn't exist, then whatever created the space time continuum can't be part of the space time continuum. It must be something that transcends it; a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent...you have to have a mind in order to make a choice, and to be personal in order to make a choice. Now, when you think about a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent, cause, who do you think of? God.

You say, well, Frank, how do you know it's the Christian God? We don't yet. We haven't done enough research yet. The cosmological argument does not get you all the way to Christianity. This could be the Christian God, but it could also be our or some other theistic God. We don't know yet. We have to look at the historical evidence for whether or not Jesus rose from the dead to discover whether or not the cause of the beginning of the universe is the Christian God. And after we do that, I think the evidence will show us, if we're open to it, that the same being that walked out of the tomb 1988 years ago, is the same being and whose divine nature created the universe out of nothing. Jesus is the creator.

Now what do atheists say about this? Well, if you're someone like Lawrence Krauss, who wrote the book, *A Universe from Nothing*, he says that the universe came from nothing but his nothing is not nothing. His nothing is a quantum vacuum. A quantum vacuum, my friends, is not nothing. It's something. What evidence does he have that the universe came from a quantum vacuum? And secondly, where did the quantum vacuum come from?

And look, if you're going to say that the entire universe can come into existence without a cause, as some atheists will say, it came from nothing and by nothing without a cause, then my question is: Why doesn't everything come into existence without a cause? Why don't Tesla's

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

come into existence without a cause? You wake up one morning and look in your driveway, your Hyundai is a Tesla. You go, how do I charge this thing? No. I mean, why don't MacBook Pros come into existence out of nothing, by nothing, without a cause? Why don't podcasts come into existence out of nothing, by nothing, without a cause? Why doesn't everything come into existence without a cause?

I mean, if the whole universe can do so, why does everything do so? And if everything could do that, or if anything could do that, you can't do science anymore because science is a search for causes. That's what you're doing when you're doing science. You've got an effect you're trying to figure out what caused it. If an atheist is going to come along and say, well, I've got an effect that doesn't need a cause, then how can you do science? You've made it impossible by assuming that effects can come into existence without a cause. What you're doing when you're doing science is you're looking at effects and you're reasoning back to a cause. If you're gonna say, there's no cause for the effect, you can't do science.

More on this right after the break. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek of the American Family Radio Network. Back in two.

Ad: If you found value in the content of this podcast don't forget to follow us on Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter. Join our online community to have great conversations, grow in your knowledge of God and become a better defender of the Christian faith. Also, don't forget to subscribe to our YouTube channel, where we have hundreds of videos and over 100,000 subscribers that are part of an online family. Find those by searching for Frank Turek or Cross Examined in the search bar. You can find many more resources like articles, online courses, free downloadable materials, event calendars, and more at CrossExamined.org.

Do extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence? First, we got to define what we mean by extraordinary. But secondly, no matter how you define the term extraordinary, if you're an atheist, it seems to me that, although you'll try and apply this claim...the philosophical claim that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence...you will apply it to Christians, but you won't apply it to your own extraordinary claims. This is called special pleading. It says, heads I win, tails you lose. This doesn't apply to me, but it applies to you. I've noticed that atheists often exempt themselves from their own theories.

**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, while we're talking about extraordinary claims, one atheist, Daniel Dennett, says that consciousness is an illusion because he can't explain consciousness naturally. And it, obviously, has some sort of supernatural aspect to it. Why? Because if we're molecules in motion, if we're just moist robots, why should we believe anything? Well, first of all, how do we have consciousness? And secondly, why should we believe anything we think if everything is controlled by the laws of physics? Our consciousness can't be completely controlled by the laws of physics. If that were the case, we shouldn't believe anything we think. Because we're not reasoning, we're just reacting.

Anyway, Dennett says consciousness is an illusion. Well, one wonders if he was conscious when he wrote that. Notice that he doesn't think his consciousness is an illusion. He needs his consciousness to write books that claim that everyone else's consciousness is an illusion. In other words, he's exempting himself from his own theory. He's saying his consciousness is not an illusion, just yours is. And if he thinks his own consciousness is an illusion then why should he believe anything he thinks, including all his theories about atheism, including all these theories about consciousness? It's a self-defeating claim.

And by the way, in order to know that your consciousness is an illusion, you'd have to get outside your consciousness. Just like in order to know you're just having a dream, what do you have to do? You have to wake up. Okay. You have to get outside the dream to say, whew, that was just a dream. You ever nightmare and you're relieved when you wake up? You go, wow, I'm glad that didn't happen. Yeah, the only way you know it didn't happen is because you got the more than knowledge of being awake. You got outside the dream to say, that was just a dream. Same thing is true with consciousness. To say that your consciousness is just an illusion, you'd have to get outside your consciousness. You would have to have consciousness outside your own consciousness. You'd have to have some sort of super consciousness. You'd have to, sort of, be God to say that my consciousness is just an illusion. So, it's a self-defeating claim.

But that's an extraordinary claim, isn't it? Isn't it extraordinary to say that consciousness is an illusion? Does he have any evidence for it? No, he had zero evidence for it. Zero, and yet, he's claiming it's true. So, the atheist does not even live by his own maxim, that extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. They don't do so at the beginning of the universe, as I mentioned. They're claiming, well, the universe could come into existence out of nothing by

**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**

nothing. That's an extraordinary claim, never been witnessed, and there's no evidence for it, and yet, you're claiming it's true. The universe came from a quantum vacuum; extraordinary claim never been witnessed yet you're claiming it's true. How much evidence you have for it? Zero. There's no evidence for it.

Oh, we've seen that particles come into existence without a cause in the quantum vacuum. You've seen that? Really? How do you know that's true? It could be that your very attempt to witness the quantum realm is causing the unpredictable phenomenon you are witnessing. This is sometimes Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle doesn't say that things in the quantum realm are coming into existence without a cause. What it says is, you can't predict the simultaneous speed and location of any quantum particle. Why can't you predict it? Well, maybe it's because when you try and observe it, you're disturbing the quantum realm so you can't predict the simultaneous speed and location of a quantum particle in the quantum vacuum.

Now, all this is very controversial. What I'm saying may not be true. I'm simply saying it's possible. The very attempt to observe the quantum realm may be the cause of the disturbances or the unpredictable nature of the quantum realm that you are witnessing. Because if you try and observe it, by putting a photon of light off a quantum particle, the photon may have more mass than the quantum particle you're trying to observe. And so, by putting light on it, you're causing the disturbance. And you think the disturbance is what's happening but you're actually causing the disturbance. It's sort of like putting your head in a beehive and wondering why all the bees are buzzing around. Because you put your head in there, that's why. Or it's like witnessing your eyelashes in the microscope. The phenomenon you're observing, you're causing. And even if you're right, that things are popping into existence without a cause in the quantum realm, that doesn't mean that that's evidence for that the entire quantum realm doesn't have a cause, or the entire universe doesn't have a cause. So, you're making an extraordinary claim, and yet, you have no evidence for it.

Now, also, people don't believe in miracles because, well, they've never seen one. Well, you believe in a lot of things you've never seen. Right? You believe in your mind. Have you ever seen it? Nope. You're using it right now. You believe in the laws of logic. Have you ever seen those? Nope. You're using them right now. You believe in justice. Have you ever seen justice? A

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

lot of talk about justice, by the way, in our society. It's important, obviously, but justice is not something you see. It's not a physical thing, it's an immaterial virtue grounded in the nature of God. You've never seen love. What? Never seen it. Nope. Not something you see. It's an immaterial thing, immaterial virtue grounded in the nature of God that you've never seen. Oh, you may have loved somebody, you may have been loved, but you've never seen love because it's not something you see. It's not a physical thing.

So, there's a lot of things you believe that you've never seen. George Washington. How do you know it's true, then? How do you know he existed? Well, because there's evidence that George Washington existed. In fact, there are effects left behind by a man named George Washington that are best explained by a man named George Washington. In other words, we don't see George Washington directly now, but we see his effects. And that's what scientists do. Again, they are witnessing an effect and they're trying to discover what the cause of the effect was.

And the same thing is true with God. We don't see God directly. He's an immaterial being. We won't see him for who he is, until we get to heaven, the beatific vision, 1 John 3:2, we won't see him for who he is until we get to heaven. In the meantime, we see his effects. This is why Paul says, his invisible qualities are clearly seen so that men are without excuse. His divine attributes are clearly seen so men are without excuse. You see the effect and so you reason back to the cause. You see a creation; you reason back to a cause there must be a creator. You see design in the universe, that's the effect, you reason back to a cause there must be a designer. You have a moral law that is pressing on you, you realize that's the effect, you reason back to a cause, a moral law giver.

So, you get these attributes of God by what's called natural theology. You don't even need the Bible to know this stuff. You have effects you reason back to a cause. So, you see an effect, the universe; you see space, matter, and time being effects, you reason back to a cause; a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent, moral being that created and sustains all things. You're reasoning from effect back to cause.

And by the way, miracles are possible because if the first verse of the Bible is true...in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth...then every other verse is at least possible. And we now even have atheists admitting that the data for the first verse, in the beginning 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**

created the heavens and the earth, the data that there was a beginning is true. It's true that there was a beginning. Even atheists are admitting it. And if there was a beginning, there must be a beginner; a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent cause. So, atheists try and explain the beginning of the universe, an extraordinary claim that, either nothing caused it, or the quantum vacuum caused it...which itself would need a cause. An extraordinary claim with, not only, not extraordinary evidence, but no evidence.

How about the theological or the teleological argument, the fine tuning of the universe? Do you realize the initial conditions of the universe are fine-tuned? What do I mean by the initial conditions? Well, how the universe began from the very beginning. Stephen Hawking, again, the great atheist/physicist, said this about the beginning of the universe, and this is probably an underestimate. Hawking said, "if the expansion rate of the universe was different by one part in 1000 million a second after the Big Bang, the universe would have collapsed back on itself or never developed galaxies. In other words, if the expansion rate were imperceptibly different, from the very beginning, this universe wouldn't exist. Or if it did exist, there'd be no life on it. No galaxies would have formed. Yet here we are.

It's an extraordinary claim to say that there was no designer for this, because the evidence shows there was. You can't make any sort of evolutionary argument for the initial conditions. Why? Because the expansion rate did not evolve over time to that rate. It started there. Seems to me the best explanation is, the same being that created space, matter, and time is the same being that fine-tuned the expansion rate to be precisely what it needed to be for this universe to exist. It's an extraordinary claim to say that this just happened by chance. What's chance? Is chance a cause? Does chance cause things? Who caused this? Chance! He was just here. No, chance is not a cause. Chance is a word we use to describe mathematical possibilities. Chance doesn't cause a thing. Chance is a word we use, basically, to cover our ignorance.

When scientists use the word chance in this context, anyway, what they really mean is we don't know. That's not extraordinary evidence, friends. Or that's not extraordinary evidence for the extraordinary claim that there was no mind behind the universe, that there is no intelligence behind the universe. And yet, atheists make the claim all the time. Or they'll come up with a multiverse to explain this. That's an extraordinary claim that there are other universes out there and ours just happens to be fine-tuned by chance. Because if you have enough universes,

**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**

one of them is going to turn out this way, according to them. That's an extraordinary claim with absolutely zero evidence. No, there's no evidence there's a multiverse. We can't witness these avenues. We can't witness these universes that are other than ours. We can't get outside of our own universe and witness these things. There's no there's no evidence for it. And yet, they're claiming that this is true. This is why even agnostic astronomer Paul Davies says the multiverse is a dodge. Why? Because they're trying to dodge the obvious implication that there's a mind behind this universe that fine-tuned the initial conditions and also fine-tuned the current conditions, which we'll get to right after the break. So, don't go anywhere. I'm Frank Turek. Our website is CrossExamined.org. And we're back in just two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

Ad: 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 CrossExamined.org? 100% of your donations go to ministry, 0% to buildings. We're completely virtual. So, if you can help us out, we greatly appreciate it. Thank you so much.

Welcome back to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family radio Network. We're talking about this claim, this slogan, that atheists often bring up when they say things like, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. And right now, we're in the middle of pointing out that they don't even apply that to their own claims. They're exempting themselves from their own theory. Okay? How about the current conditions of the universe, say gravity? If the gravitational force were altered by more than one part in 10 to the 40th power, we would not exist. What's one part in 10 to the 40th power? That's one part in one with 40 zeros following it. You say, Frank, I can't get my head around that number. I know, neither can I.

So, let me let me give you an illustration. Take a tape measure and stretch it across the entire known universe. That's a long way. You can't get that tape measure at Lowe's, by the way. Set the gravitational force at a particular inch mark on that tape measure. I realize gravity is not measured in inches. This is just to give you a scale idea in your mind. If the strength of gravity were different by one inch in either direction, across the scale as wide as the entire known universe, we wouldn't be here. That's one in 10 to the 40th precision. I don't have enough faith to believe that that value just landed there by chance. And, as I mentioned before the break, chance is not a cause. Okay. Look, there's only two possible explanations for why that particular

**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**

value is where it is. The gravitational force, either it was designed, or it wasn't designed to be there. Either somebody put it there, or they didn't put it there. Now question. Which view is more reasonable? Obviously, that it was designed. It's an extraordinary claim to say it wasn't designed, and what evidence do you have for it? Zero, that it wasn't designed.

So, it seems to me that atheists are exempting themselves from their own slogan when they say, you need extraordinary evidence for an extraordinary claim. And let me ask you guys a question. What about natural laws themselves? This is one natural law, gravity, of course. Why are the natural laws so fine-tuned? Why are they so precise? Why are they so consistent? Why doesn't the ordinary state of affairs, our precise and orderly cause and effect in the natural world that we witness...we witness the same thing happening over and over again. You know, you take two parts hydrogen, one part oxygen, you put them together, you always get water, right. We witness that over and over again. Why doesn't that change? Physical things change, but the laws of nature don't change. Why isn't the natural order a chaotic mess? Why is it so orderly and precise and fine-tuned? Seems to me because this is the product of one mind, not many minds.

This universe wasn't put together, nor is this universe run by committee. This universe is run by one mind that created and sustains these natural laws. The natural laws themselves need a creator and sustainer. They're orderly. They're going in a direction. In other words, the ordinary must be explained. Not just the extraordinary. The ordinary. Why did natural laws do what they do? Because there's a mind behind them. Why does an acorn, if it's properly nourished, always become an oak tree? Why doesn't it become an elm tree, or a birch tree, or a seahorse? You say, well, Frank, it's programmed to become an oak tree. Yeah, well, who programmed it? And does an acorn have a mind? Is an acorn sitting in the ground going, alright, how do I become an oak tree? No. But it yet reliably becomes an oak tree if it's properly nourished. In other words, it goes in the direction of becoming an oak tree.

Well, if it doesn't have a mind of its own, and it doesn't, then there must be an external mind directing it toward an end, and the natural laws that directed toward an end. And that is what Aristotle called, the unmoved mover. Thomas Aquinas came along in the 1200s and said, this is going to be my fifth way to argue for God. That there has to be a sustaining cause for these natural laws. If there's a direction to the universe, if there's a direction to things in 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**

then there must be a director. There has to be a mind that sustains all things. Now, notice, this is not a historical cause that Aquinas and Aristotle are talking about. They're not talking about, say, a big bang cause. In fact, both of them thought the universe...well, Aquinas thought the universe had a beginning because of the Bible but he didn't know if you could prove that philosophically. Aristotle thought the universe was eternal. He was mistaken about that. So, he was not talking about a historical cause that started the universe, he's talking about a mind that keeps the universe going, including all the natural laws that are precise and orderly and do the same thing over and over again.

In fact, God is to the universe, what a band is to music. What do I mean by that? If a band is playing music, the band is creating and sustaining the music at the same time. What happens to the music the second the band stops playing? Music is over. Same thing is true with God. God creates the universe and the natural laws that govern it, and he creates you. And then he sustains the universe and the natural laws, that govern it, and he sustains you at the same time. In other words, he's just not a cause that created the universe, he's a cause that keeps the universe running every single second. This is the fifth way that Aquinas had to argue for God. I think it's a very persuasive way, if you understand it. That everything is orderly, going in a direction.

This is why when atheists ask for evidence, what are they presupposing? I mean, I'm glad they're asking for evidence. What are they presupposing? They're presupposing that this is an orderly world, that things go in a direction consistently. And they're also presupposing that their minds can understand this orderly world and they can ascertain truths about this orderly world. Well, what best explains that? What best explains our ability even to reason? How can we get outside of our own skulls and look out at the world through our senses and draw conclusions that are true about it? Seems to me the best explanation for why there's a world at all, and why it's orderly, and why our minds can ascertain truths about this real world, and why consistent cause and effect occurs in the real world, and why there's probability, and why there's evidence, is because this whole thing has been set up and sustained, currently sustained, by a mind.

If you're going to say otherwise, it seems to be you're stealing from God to argue against him. When you say, I have evidence that God doesn't exist, or I have evidence that things happen

**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**

contrary to what the Bible says, then you're presupposing that evidence exists, you're presupposing order exists, you're presupposing your mind can ascertain these truths and draw valid true conclusions about the universe. And that variability, it seems to me, is better explained by a mind than no mind. So, I can ask this question: What is the probability we would have evidence for anything if this universe was not the product of the mind? It seems to me very low. Seems to me probability wouldn't exist if there's no order, if natural laws didn't exist.

First of all, it seems to me, we wouldn't exist. But if we did, we wouldn't exist in a way that could ascertain truths about the real world. That's a whole other argument that truth must be ultimately grounded in a mind, a mind that is eternal, because before there were any human minds on the earth, things were still true, right. In fact, the claim, there are no human minds on the earth, was true when there were no human minds on the earth, but there were no human minds in order to ground that truth. This is Augustin's argument from truth. This is why Jesus said, I am the truth. He grounds all truth. He is the ground of everything that exists. The foundation of everything that exists is God. And Jesus claimed to be God.

So, what is the probability we would have evidence for anything? Not just Christianity, but evidence for anything: Evidence that that water exists? Evidence that trees exist? Evidence that the universe exists?...if it was not the product of a mind...if this universe, this reality, was not the product of a mind? I think very low. In fact, I think it's an extraordinary claim to say that God doesn't exist. It's not an extraordinary claim to say He does, because so many things are explained by a mind, including the very question of: Why does anything exist? Or why is there evidence for anything? Or what is the probability that God exists or doesn't exist? All those claims imply a mind, they imply order.

And I'm not even getting to half of what I want to say on this program. We're running out of time here. There's so much evidence that Christianity is true, that a mind exists, and our very desire for evidence, and our very ability to acquire evidence, presupposes a mind that I don't even have enough time to cover it all here. We're gonna have to cover this in a future program, either next podcast or the one after.

But if you want to know, by the way, evidence for the resurrection, and evidence for Christianity, then you may want to sign up for Jim's course, the Cold Case Christianity course.

**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**

Which, as I say, starts Monday. Go to CrossExamined.org, click on online courses and get in now because, once we reach a certain level, we close the course for the premium version. Otherwise, there's too many people in it and you won't have an opportunity to ask Jim a question. There's several zooms for this particular course, Cold Case Christianity. I'm going to teach a new course on the book of Romans, the great book of Romans, probably my favorite book in the Bible, that's going to begin toward the end of March or early April, so keep an eye out for that. But in the meantime, check out Jim's course, Cold Case Christianity.

And also want to mention, I'm going to be in Charlotte, North Carolina, which is my hometown, by the way, March 23rd. I'm going to be here in Charlotte for a home game. Go to our website, CrossExamined.org, which by the way, is being updated right now. Click on events, click on Frank Turek Calendar and you'll see it there. It's a Tuesday night, the 23rd, right here in Charlotte, North Carolina. All the details are on our website. So, I'll see you there and I'll see you here next week, Lord willing, God bless. See you next time.

Ad: 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](#)