

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

## **Murder Without a Cause**

(March 6, 2021)

Ladies and gentlemen, in 1994, there were a couple of bodies found in Brentwood, California. It looked like it was a brutal slash and dash murder. Nicole Brown Simpson and Ron Goldman were killed in front of Nicole Brown Simpson's house in Brentwood, there was blood everywhere, and the prime suspect at the time was a former football player by the name of OJ Simpson. Now those of you who are as old as I am know who OJ was. For those of you that are a little bit younger, you may not have heard of OJ, or if you have you don't really know who he was. OJ Simpson won a Heisman Trophy with the University of Southern California when he was in college. And then he went and played running back with the Buffalo Bills. In fact, he was so good as a Bill's running back he was one of the top running backs of all time.

And one of the announcers on Monday Night Football years ago was a guy by the name of Howard Cosell. And those of you again are old enough know who I'm talking about, Cosell would always say, because OJ Simpson, of course, his nickname was The Juice, being OJ. And so, Cosell would say stuff like, Miami has the oranges, but Buffalo has the juice. And then they'd show highlights of OJ running through everybody. He was a great running back.

But he was the prime suspect in this 1994 set of murders. Both occurred at the same time, it appeared. And it went to trial, of course, and it turned out to be one of the trials of the century. And I'm going to give you some evidence that was presented at trial and then I'm going to ask you a question. Here is some of the evidence presented at trial: OJ Simpson's blood was at the scene of the crime. There is only a one in 170 million chance that it really was not OJ's blood, so obviously, it really was OJ's blood. Now this actually led to a couple of magazine covers; I think Newsweek had one called, A Trail of Blood. It showed OJ on the cover and the title was, A Trail of Blood, because literally there was a trail of blood from that crime scene all the way to OJ Simpson.

The second piece of evidence, the blood of Ron Goldman, one of the murder victims. The blood of Nicole Brown Simpson, OJ's former wife, another murder victim. And OJ Simpson himself, his

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

blood was found in OJ Simpson's white Bronco. And for those of you that can remember, OJ was trying to flee from the police, at some point after the murders, in his white Bronco. He was being driven by a friend of his. He, apparently, was in the backseat of this white Bronco. He had a gun, he threatened to kill himself, he really looked guilty. He was fleeing at normal speed but there were choppers over, and I mean, they were just trying to bring him into custody. He finally pulled over and they took him into custody but his blood and the murder victims all over that Bronco.

Number three, the bloody glove found at the scene of the crime had blood from all three, the two murder victims and OJ, and it matched the glove at OJ Simpson's house. In fact, OJ Simpson, being retired from football at the time, was a sideline reporter for NFL games. And sometimes he'd be on the sideline holding a microphone and he'd be wearing gloves. Well, one of the gloves that he was wearing was found at the crime scene drenched in blood and the sister glove was found at his house.

Number four...oh, by the way, for those of you who remember the trial, his trial attorney, Johnnie Cochran, had a great line because OJ was going to try the glove on in the courtroom. And Johnnie Cochran said, "if the glove doesn't fit, you must acquit". Because it doesn't fit OJ he's not the killer, right? That's what he was trying to say. So, OJ tries to put this glove...on he has a surgical glove on, you know, one that doctors use when they operate, or you know the ones that you're wearing now when you go to the department store. Anyway, he tries to put this glove on during the trial, and he's trying to get it on, and he can't get it on. Now why can't he get it on? Number one, he had that surgical glove on it made it more difficult to fit. Number two, the glove had shrunk from the blood, the dried blood in it. And number three, quite obviously, he didn't want to put it on. Okay?

So, number four, the fourth piece of evidence, was that the bloody footprints at the scene of the crime were from a rare brand of size 12 shoes that OJ Simpson owned. There were only 199 pairs of these shoes sold in the United States and OJ had one of these pairs at his house.

And number five, the fifth line of evidence, was that Nicole Brown Simpson's blood was found on OJ Simpson's socks. There is only a one in 21 billion chance, according to one lab, that that was not her blood. Okay, let me review. All three of the people involved, blood found at the

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

crime scene. One in 70 million chance it's not OJ Simpson's blood. All three found in Simpson's Bronco, the blood from all three. The glove at the scene had blood from all three and matched the glove at Simpson's house. The bloody footprints found at the crime scene were footprints from a rare brand of shoes that Simpson owned. And the blood found on Simpson's socks was Nicole Brown Simpson's blood; only a one in 21 billion chance it wasn't her blood.

Question. Was Simpson guilty of murder? Let me ask you a question in a different way. What is the probability that this evidence would exist if OJ Simpson was not the murderer? Well, that was kind of the defense line of reasoning. OJ was framed. That's basically what they were saying. Really? You think that's a good explanation? How could all of this blood have been planted on OJ if he was framed? How could it be found in his house? How could it be found in his Bronco? How could it be found in his socks? Are you saying the police were that corrupt, that somehow...and that inventive, that they somehow framed OJ and put this blood everywhere? Doesn't seem likely. Doesn't even seem remotely likely. But that's what you're gonna have to believe to say he's not the murderer.

Again, what is the probability this evidence would exist if OJ was not the murderer? You might be able to explain one line of evidence here to say, okay, that could have been planted, but all of it. And what motive did the LAPD have to plant the blood? Look, everybody loved OJ. OJ was a celebrity. OJ was a movie star too. You know, those old airplane movies? OJ was in them. People loved OJ. Why would they want to frame him? And could they frame him with this vast amount of evidence? You know, again, you might be able to explain one piece of evidence by another theory. But can you explain all of the evidence by that theory, that say, the LAPD framed him? No, I don't think you can.

You see, when you're looking at a particular set of facts, and you're trying to figure out what causes these particular set of facts, or you're looking at a bunch of evidence, and you're trying to figure out what caused this evidence, you've got to have two things. You got to have explanatory power and explanatory scope. Explanatory power as, how well does your theory explain the data? And explanatory scope says, how well does your theory explain all of the data, not just one line of evidence, but all of the data? And look, OJ had a motive. He was jealous. He also had the means. He was strong, quite obviously, a former football player. Seems like OJ could have done this and he had the motive to do it.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now what if somebody comes along and says, you know, I just lack a belief OJ was the killer. And you go, okay, you don't think it's OJ. Well, who do you think it was? And they go, oh, well, I don't have to have a suspect. I just lacked a belief it was OJ. But how do you explain all this evidence? I don't have to explain it. I just lack belief it was OJ. Would you take that to be a good detective if a detective said that? No. You would say, first of all, you gotta explain why you don't think it's OJ. And secondly, you got to come up with somebody else, or at least some other theory. And that's what we're going to talk about the rest of the show.

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 just two minutes. Don't go anywhere else.

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 evidence. And we're talking about the situation with OJ Simpson, who by the way, for those of you that know the trial, OJ was ultimately acquitted of this crime. He was found guilty in a civil trial later. But it turned out when they interviewed the jury afterwards, that the jury was never going to convict OJ. If they had video of him doing it, they probably wouldn't have convicted him. I mean, that's how biased the jury was.

Which is why our friend, J. Warner Wallace, who, as you know, is a cold case homicide detective, says jury selection is the key to the outcome of the trial. You've got to get the right jury, who's going to be fair, and look at the evidence in a way that is fair to everybody, in order to get the right outcome. And in that case, apparently, they did not have a fair trial. But the reason I asked the question before the break is, if someone comes along and says, I lack a belief it was OJ, you'd have to say to them, okay, but how do you explain all this evidence...right...that's pointing directly to OJ? How do you explain it all? And if they say, well, I don't need to explain it, I just lack a belief in OJ, you'd say, well, you're really not doing your job.

And this is what atheists...many of them, I can't speak for all them...but many of them will say, I just lack a belief in God. And yet, here we are, as Christians, coming forth with all this evidence that God exists, which we'll get to later in the program. We covered some of it a couple of weeks ago. But we talked about, just for example, the cosmological argument. In fact, we covered that a couple of weeks ago, so I won't repeat it here. But space, matter and time had a

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

beginning and there's evidence for this. We cover it all in the book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. Even atheists are admitting that space, matter and time had a beginning. So, whatever created space, matter and time would seem to not 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, and also intelligent to have a mind to choose to create. Now that points to a being that we would call God. We don't know if it's the Christian God at this point, but it could be. So, when you ask the atheist, well, how do you explain all this evidence? Sometimes they just say, a lack of belief it's God. And you know, one day we'll figure out a natural cause for all this. To which we respond, you'll never find a natural cause for all of nature. Nature is the effect it can't be the cause. If nature had a beginning, whatever created nature can't be made of nature. The cause must transcend nature. In other words, the cause must be supernatural or what we would call, supernatural. So, just claiming to be a lack of belief; you know, I'm an atheist, I lack a belief in God. They say that now.

First of all, let's unpack that claim a little bit. To lack a belief in God is just to say something about your psychological state. It's not to say something about the real world. I could say I lacked a belief in materialism, which is what many atheists believe, but that wouldn't prove or disprove materialism, it would just tell you what my psychological state was. I'd have to give evidence that materialism was false if I thought it was false. Okay? Just saying, I lack a belief in materialism, or a lack of belief in evolution, doesn't say anything about whether or not evolution is true or not. It just explains my psychological state.

Secondly, when people say, I lack a belief in God, what I like to say is, okay, if you're going to define atheism that way, let's just take the definitions, or I should say, the labels aside, and let me just ask you this question. Here's the proposition. God exists. Question. Do you agree with that proposition, do you disagree with that proposition, or are you in the middle going, I just don't know? I don't know if it's true or it's false. If you agree with that proposition, you're a theist, or at least a deist. If you disagree with that proposition, you're an atheist. And if you don't know, you're an agnostic. So, where are you? You're one of those three, right? Let's forget about what the definition of atheism is. Let's just ask that question and see what you say about

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

it. God exists; agree, disagree, don't know? If you agree, theist; or disagree, atheist; don't know, agnostic.

Can we at least agree on that? Okay, great. So, if you have all this evidence, and you're trying to find who committed the murder, you're going to ask somebody who is a detective: Who do you think did it? Now you don't have to come up with another explanation to say that OJ didn't do it. You know, you don't have to find the true murderer to say OJ is not guilty. But with all this evidence pointing to OJ's guilt you really got to figure out how you can explain this evidence and say, OJ is not guilty.

Now, suppose an atheist were to come along and see all this evidence for OJ being the murderer and he says, all this can be explained naturally. Actually, in fact, they weren't murders, despite the fact that there are knife cuts on all these people, and stabbings, they died of natural causes. What would you say? You'd say, oh, come on, that's ridiculous. We don't see these pieces of evidence coming from natural causes. You know, people don't just, like, run into a drawer of knives and all this happens, right. It wasn't an accident. Natural laws don't put cuts in people like this. There aren't footprints around, there's not blood from a third party around, this can't be a natural cause. This is quite obviously a homicide. So, it can't be explained naturally. Yet atheists will try and say, well, the whole universe can be explained naturally; when it had a beginning, and it had a fine-tuned beginning, which seems to imply that whatever caused the universe is also intelligent. In fact, we'll get into fine tuning here in a minute. So, you can't say it can be explained all naturally.

Or what if someone comes along and sees all the evidence for these two murders and says, actually, there was no cause. The bodies got that way without a cause. It wasn't even natural causes it was just no cause. You'd say, oh, come on. Really? No cause? Some are saying that the universe exploded into being out of nothing; no cause it just happened. You wouldn't accept that for the OJ Simpson murders, and you shouldn't accept it, therefore, for the creation of the universe, or some of the other evidence that we're going to get into, because murders don't happen without a cause. Creations don't happen without a creator. Design doesn't happen without a designer. Laws don't come about without law givers.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

And if you want to say that you can have murder without a cause, creation without a creator, design without a designer, laws without a law giver, then the burden of proof is on you because all the counter evidence suggests just the opposite, that things have causes. And if you're going to do away with causes, you're going to have to do away with all science, because science is built on finding cause and effect. That's what you do when you're doing science; you're trying to figure out what particular cause caused a particular effect. And if you're going to say that effects can arise without causes, then you might as well just give up on all science. And yet, atheists are supposed to be champions of science. Turns out you can't do science without certain metaphysical principles, which seems to imply there's a cause behind those metaphysical principles, some metaphysical being perhaps, and we're going to get into that here shortly.

Now, let me go back to all that evidence for OJ. When you see all the evidence, you know, about 1 in 170,000,00 million, and 1 in 21 billion, and those shoes found, the glove found, the blood found for all three everywhere: Does science show that OJ is guilty? I mean, one in 170,000,00 million, 1 in 21 billion, I mean, the science show he's guilty. Now, be careful how you answer here because the answer is no. Not because I think OJ was innocent but because, science doesn't say anything, scientists do. Science doesn't say a word. In order for science to be done, you need human beings to gather data, and then interpret the data, and that's done in the mind. Science is more done in the mind than in the lab. If there were no human beings, there would be no such thing as science. So, science doesn't say a word, scientists do.

By the way, you ever noticed why you get conflicting scientific advice regarding COVID? Why is that? Because science doesn't say a word, scientists say things. And sometimes they have different data and so they come to different conclusions. Or sometimes they have the same data, but they interpret the data differently, so they come to different conclusions. Sometimes this is based on good philosophical principles and sometimes it's based on bad philosophical principles. In any event, science doesn't say anything, scientists do. So, as soon as an atheist says, well, sciences this, or science that. you want to stop them and say, no, science actually doesn't say anything, it's scientists who say things.

Now if somebody says, look, well, science says that there are two parts hydrogen, one part oxygen, gives you water, okay, you're gonna forgive the imprecision if he says that, because

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

that's something you can repeat over and over again, and it's a well-established scientific fact that that's the case. But it might not be so well established, that say...in fact, it's not, scientifically, that life came from non-life without intelligent intervention. In fact, even honest atheists like Richard Dawkins will say, nobody knows how life began because there's no natural way of explaining it at this point. Okay, science doesn't say anything, scientists do. So, whenever you come across data, you got to realize that all data needs to be gathered, and all data needs to be interpreted.

Now, here's the question: How do you interpret the fact that the evidence seems to point out that there was a beginning to the universe? There was also fine tuning of the universe and fine tuning of the laws of physics. Also, we're assuming there's cause and effect because we see that wherever we go. Every effect has a cause. That's what science is built on. We also know that there's consciousness and there's life that has consciousness. We also know that there's objective morality; that it's really true that it's wrong to torture babies for fun, it's wrong to murder people, it's wrong to treat people with disrespect, if they're made in the image and likeness of God. Also, there are laws of logic and reason. In fact, if we say there are not laws of logic and reason, we're using those laws to say that it's self-defeating to say they don't exist.

Now, keep in mind here, I'm going somewhere with this. I'm asking you: What is the cause of all these things? How about the laws of mathematics? Way back in 1961, Eugene Wagner wrote a paper called, The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics. Why can we describe the universe in the language of math? If there's not a mind behind this universe that would seem to be a very happy coincidence that can't be explained. In fact, the laws of mathematics themselves, where did they come from? How about intelligence? Where does intelligence come from? Look, at the end of the day, there's only two possibilities; either mind gave rise to matter or matter gave rise to mind. In other words, what is the ultimate reality? Is it matter or mind? Well, matter had a beginning. Matter is dumb by itself. It seems like mind is the ultimate foundation of all things which gave rise to matter.

How about personality? Where does personality come from? There are so many different personalities, so many different people, everybody's unique in their personality. Where does that come from if everything is driven just completely by natural laws? How about Old Testament prophecy? How about the evidence for the resurrection? What is the best explanation of all this? What theory will have the proper explanatory power and scope to

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

explain all of this? It's certainly not atheism. It's certainly not that there is no God. It's certainly not that everything's made of molecules. Many of the things I just listed here are made of molecules. In fact, molecules had a beginning, according to the evidence. Something beyond molecules, something beyond physics; metaphysics. We'll get to it after the break. I'm Frank Turek. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, on the American Family Radio Network. We're back in two minutes.

You know, two weeks ago last week, a great podcast from my friend, Alisa Childers, on Progressive Christianity. If you haven't heard that, go and listen to that, because it's coming to a church near you, unfortunately. And the week before that I did the podcast regarding Ravi Zacharias, the Ravi Zacharias scandal and the truth of Christianity. You know that that podcast on YouTube, which is not where most people watch podcasts...they listen to it on iTunes and other places. That podcast on YouTube has had 10 times as many views as just about any other one we've done.

Now, let me ask you a question: Why are we so intrigued with scandal? We could do a podcast on the truth of Christianity, which we're doing right now, and a podcast about a man who fell from grace, and was a sinner, and was a charlatan gets 10 times as many views as what's the most important thing and that is that Christianity is true. In fact, I spent a lot of time, actually, in that podcast pointing out that what Ravi did, actually, couldn't be wrong unless something like Christianity was true because, if there is no God, there is no such thing as right or wrong, everything's a matter of opinion and you can't condemn Ravi for any of his behavior. So, it's just interesting to me.

It's like when we pass somebody on the road and they have a flat tire, we just zoom right by. But man, if there's a wreck, we're slowing down, rubbernecking, going, oh look at that. Why is that? Why are we intrigued when evil occurs? Why are we intrigued when bad things happen? Why are we intrigued when somebody is exposed as a hypocrite? It says something about our nature, doesn't it? I mean, I'm not exempting myself from this. I'm just pointing out it's just human nature that we tend to do that.

Oh, let me also point out that we have a brand new course is starting on, I think it's March 30, The Book of Romans. I'll be your instructor. We're going through it in 19 one hour lessons and if

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

you take the premium version, I'll be your instructor live on zoom. I think on about 10 different occasions, we're going to do Q&A 10 different times. And if you sign up by March 8, which is just around the corner here, you can get, I think 25% off, or something. Just go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org) and click on online courses. You'll see it there.

Alright, let me go back to what we were talking about. Just before the break, I mentioned the beginning of the universe and design of the universe, the laws of physics, cause and effect, life and consciousness, objective morality, the laws of logic and reason, the laws of mathematics, intelligence, personality, Old Testament prophecy, and the resurrection of Jesus. Here's my question: What is the probability we would have all of this evidence if God did not exist? And what is the probability we would have this evidence if Jesus did not rise from the dead? And I'll get you a little bit of evidence for the resurrection here in a minute. In fact, what is the probability we would have evidence for anything if this universe was not the product of a mind? Because this universe is orderly, things happen for a reason, there's cause and effect.

Now, natural laws, the laws of nature, are fine tuned. We're gonna get into it here in a second. They're precise Why? What best explains this? In other words, again, instead of just looking at the evidence, saying: Okay, does this evidence point to God?, you could also look at it from the other side of it and say: Would we even have this evidence if there wasn't a God? And probability theorists who do this, plug this into their equations, you know, Bayesian probability theory and all that...we're not going to get into it here. But the likelihood of something happening, or something being true, based on probability theory also includes the factor that says: What is the probability we would have all this evidence if the question that we're trying to discover, or the cause we're trying discover did not exist? Why would we have all this evidence if God did not exist? Why would we have all this evidence for the resurrection if Jesus didn't rise from the dead? So, you can look at it that way.

Let's talk about fine tuning for a minute. There's two kinds of fine tuning; there's the fine tuning of the universe in its initial conditions and its current conditions, and there's also the fine tuning of the biological information in life. Let's talk about both. We'll talk about in life to begin with. Do you know that in every one of your 40 trillion, or so, cells there's a program that's about 3.2 billion letters long; all the letters are in the right order, save a mutation here or there? We've never seen a program come from anything other than a programmer. We've never seen a

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

message come from anything other than a mind. I mean, if you get a text from somebody, and it says, "Hi, how are you? Love mom or love Dad". You know that message couldn't have been randomly generated by the person's iPhone. That message points towards intelligence. The same thing is true with what's in every one of your 40 trillion cells, the genome, the digital code, except it's a lot longer than, "Hi, how are you? Love Mom or Dad". It's 3.2 billion letters long. That appears to be the product of a mind.

And the attributes of our universe appear to be the product of a mind as well. From the very beginning, as we pointed out a couple of weeks ago...three weeks ago now, in the podcast entitled, *Do Extraordinary Claims Require Extraordinary Evidence?*...we pointed out that the expansion rate of the universe, if it were different by one part in 1000 million we wouldn't even have a universe, or a universe that could support life. And that was Stephen Hawking, he was an atheist, he admitted that. So, the fine tuning of the universe comprises two things. It's not just the fine tuning for life. That's one aspect of it. But unless we had certain aspects or properties of our universe fine-tuned, we wouldn't even have a universe at all, much less than universe with life.

The expansion rate is one of the factors and let me just give you a scenario. Let's suppose you're playing poker with somebody and it turns out that your opponent gets a royal flush. You thought you had a good hand, but the opponent got a royal flush. Now any hand you get in poker, let's just say it's five card poker, any hand you get in poker is going to be equally improbable. Any hand in a five card poker is 1 chance in 649,739. Any hand is that improbable. But of course, a royal flush is a targeted hand. Right? And I see atheists trying to dispute the fine tuning argument by saying, well, any set of conditions is equally improbable. Well, yeah, that's true but it turns out, in order for this universe to exist, and this universe with life, it's like getting a royal flush 100 times in a row because it's a targeted set of conditions. It's not just any condition. So, to get one royal flush, is 1 chance in 649,739. How likely is it for you to get two royal flushes in a row? Are you ready? It's 1 chance in 422,160,768,121. Now, if we put that in scientific notation, that would be one chance in four to the 11th power. Actually, not quite that good, but one chance in four with 11 zeros following it? Are you with me?

Okay, now, let me just take one factor about the universe that appears to be fine-tuned, and that's the gravitational force. The gravitational force is fine tuned to 1 in 10 to the 40th power.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

That's 1 chance in 1 with 40 zeros following it. Again, the chance you're going to get two royal flushes in a row is 1 in 4 with 11 zeros following it. The chance you're going to get the gravitational force for what it needs to be for us to have a universe, a universe with life, is 1 chance in 1 with 40 zeros following it. You can't even comprehend that number. I can't.

I'll give you an illustration. Take a tape measure and stretch it across the entire known universe. That's a long way. Set the gravitational force at a particular inch mark on that tape measure. I realized gravity is not measured in inches, but this just gives you a scale idea in your mind. If you were to move the strength of gravity one inch in either direction across the scale as wide as the entire known universe, we wouldn't be here. That's 1 in 10 to the 40th precision. I don't have enough faith to believe that that happened without intelligence.

Look, there's only two possibilities. That value is where it is because somebody designed it to be there or nobody designed it to be there, it just happened. What's more reasonable? What's more reasonable if the guy you're playing poker with gets 10 royal flushes in a row and he's dealing? It's more reasonable he's cheating, right? What if he just says, well, I lack a belief I'm cheating. You would go, I don't lack of belief you're cheating because the evidence is pointing out the fact that you are. What if he says, well no, this just happened by natural causes? You'd say, no, the evidence doesn't support that. What if he says, no, multiple universes...there are so many universes out there that we just happen to be in the one where I get 10 royal flushes in a row by chance. You're gonna say, no, that doesn't cut it either. That's an extraordinary claim that you're getting 10 royal flushes in a row without cheating, but you have no evidence for it. It's an extraordinary claim with no evidence and atheism is awash with extraordinary claims with no evidence that a universe could come from nothing by nothing. Extraordinary claim, no evidence that life can come from non-life without intelligence, that a 3.2 billion letter genetic code can come into existence without intelligence; extraordinary claim, no evidence that this universe could be so fine tuned.

And by the way, this is just one of the dozen or so factors that are fine tuned in this way. If you add them all up, it's impossible to expect that this universe doesn't have intelligence behind it. Yet, they're saying, well, fine tuning is just explained by the Multiple Universe Theory. But there's no evidence for multiple universes. You're just making it up. You're just assuming it's true. There's no evidence for it. There's so much more that we could talk about here, but can

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

you see, it's not the Christians that are making extraordinary claims and therefore require extraordinary evidence...and by the way, you got to go back to the previous podcast to unpack this further, because I explained what all this means with regard to extraordinary...it's the atheists that are making these extraordinary claims and don't have any evidence for it.

You say, what about miracles? How can we believe in miracles? Didn't David Hume say, miracles don't occur because we have a uniform experience against them? Yeah, he said that but that's actually a bias. In fact, it's a bias against the supernatural. And this is what happens quite frequently in science. There's already a bias against intelligence, there's a bias against any being that could somehow be the cause of anything we're seeing here in the real world, in the natural world. And we're going to unpack that when we come back from 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. Our website is [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). We have an App too you ought to avail yourselves of. It's free. Two words in the App Store, Cross Examined. It has a quick answer section on there that I think you'll like, it as our podcast TV show. Check it out. We're back in two.

Welcome back. We're talking about this idea that: Can there be a murder without a murderer? Can there be murder without a cause? Can there be a universe without a cause? Can there be fine tuning without a cause? Can there be, say, the laws of nature without a cause? Can there be the laws of mathematics, the laws of logic? Can there be the laws of morality without external cause beyond human beings? We've argued on this show many times, no. And many atheists will agree with that. That's why they say morality is all subjective. But the second you treat them immorally they go, that's wrong, that's absolutely wrong, you ought not do that. They have all these moral claims that they're trying to put forth in the government. This is right, this is wrong. LGBTQ rights, trans rights. There's no rights to anything if there's no God. It's just your opinion.

But anyway, I want to cover something that I haven't covered yet. I'm going to talk about miracles here in just a minute but let me deal with this issue of, people will say, well, evolution can explain morality. Evolution? How does a mutating genetic code have the capacity or the authority to tell you what to do? It doesn't. It doesn't. They're saying, oh no, you misunderstand Frank. We mean that evolution has given you the intuition that torturing babies for fun, but it's

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

not really wrong. It's just an intuition. Well, look, if evolution has given us these intuitions, that would mean that evolution has given us all our thoughts, including the thought that evolution has given us our intuition. So, why should we believe that's true? You see, it's a self-defeating position because it just doesn't affect morality, it affects all of our thoughts as well.

And this is true if materialism is true, right? If we're completely controlled by the laws of physics, then why should we believe any thought we have is true? If we can't follow the evidence where it leads, because we have a freewill mind and not just a brain, then why should we believe anything we think, including the thought that atheism is true? So, that doesn't work either. And I covered this at that in depth in the book, *Stealing from God*, if you want to go further.

Let me go back to David Hume and miracles, because David Hume said, miracles don't occur because we have a uniform experience against them. We don't see miracles we just see natural laws happening over and over again. And here's what CS Lewis said to that. Of course, CS Lewis said everything well. He said, "Now, of course, we must agree with Hume that, if there is absolutely 'uniform experience against miracles', if in other words, they have never happened, why then they never have. Unfortunately, we know the experience against them to be uniform only if we know that all the reports of them are false. And we can know all the reports to be false only if we know already that miracles have never occurred. In fact, we are arguing in a circle."

That's what Hume is doing. He's arguing in a circle. That's exactly what he's doing. And for atheism to be true, ladies and gentlemen, every spiritual experience, and every miracle claim in the history of the universe has to be false. Is that possible? I suppose it's possible. Is that reasonable? No. It takes more faith to believe that. And it seems to me...and we cover this in, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*...it seems to me that Hume is actually punishing miracles because there are rare events, when in fact, the only way a miracle would get our attention to say, hey, this is a special act of God, would be if it was a rare event. I mean, if miracles occurred all the time, they wouldn't point necessarily back to God.

I mean, imagine if resurrections occurred routinely, what would the resurrection of Christ mean to us? Nothing. You know, you go up to somebody and you say, hey, Jesus rose from the dead

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

for your sins. And the guy goes, so what? Uncle Leroy just rose from the dead two weeks ago. Now I got to give the inheritance back. You know, I mean, if miracles were routine, they wouldn't be miracles, and they wouldn't get our attention as special acts of God. But the very fact that they're rare, the very fact that the resurrection is rare, is a unique sign that God is at work, because if resurrections occurred routinely, it wouldn't be a unique sign that God is doing something special.

Now, I actually think that natural laws operating the way they do, so precisely and so consistently, is evidence for a mind, is evidence for God, because this orderly universe wouldn't be orderly, and we wouldn't have reliable cause and effect unless it was the product of a mind. But that's a whole other issue. I'm simply pointing out that, to say that miracles have never occurred because we have a uniform experience against them, is to beg the question, how do you know there's a uniform experience against them? Have you interviewed everybody in the universe exhaustively? No, of course you haven't. Is there evidence that there are miracles? Yeah. In fact, there's evidence today that there are my friend Craig Keener has a two volume set on it called, *Miracles*. It's a [unintelligible] set if you really want to get into it. But even if there were no miracles today, that doesn't mean there weren't miracles in the past. And I think we have good evidence that there are miracles, and they did occur.

So, this is why, by the way...let's go back to the point I made earlier that, science doesn't say anything, scientists do...that all data needs to be gathered, all data needs to be interpreted. This is why sometimes when you think you have a scientific consensus, you don't really have a scientific consensus based on the evidence, you have a scientific consensus based on the bias against the miraculous, because they've already decided that miracles don't occur. It was Richard Lewontin who said, the reason that we don't believe in the supernatural is because we can't let a divine foot in the door. You see, Lewontin, being a materialist said, as soon as we admit the possibility that miracles could occur, then the gig is up, materialism is false. And so, they're assuming materialism is true, not proving it's true.

And in fact, to approve materialism is true, you couldn't prove it. Why? Because you would need to have a mind that wasn't completely driven by the laws of physics so you could come to that conclusion rationally, rather than coming to the conclusion based on the laws of physics. In other words, in order to prove materialism is true, materialism would have to be false because

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

you need a freewill mind, which materialism denies, to arrive at valid conclusions about materialism. I know that can give you intellectual constipation, but that's just the way things are.

Now, if you look at the moral argument, and I know I'm jumping around. No, I can't look at the moral argument yet. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm trying to do too much in this one podcast. We're gonna finish this...I thought I could finish it today. I can't. I thought I'd have time to get into the resurrection. I don't. There's so much evidence here that I'm trying to cram in, and forgive me, we're just gonna have to come back to it later.

But let me talk another minute about miracles and the bias against them in the world of science. When you have a bias against miracles...let me put it another way...I think, when you're doing a scientific experiment, or scientific investigation, you should always look for natural causes first. But if two conditions are met, you have not found a natural cause and, critically, there's positive evidence pointing toward intelligence, then you could at least be open to an intelligent cause. You just can't say, because I haven't found a natural cause yet there is no natural cause. That would be guilty of god of the gaps reasoning. But if there is no natural cause, and the effect you're looking at looks like it has evidence for an intelligent being, like a program or like a message...you know, "Hi son. Hi daughter. It's me, Mom. I'm here". If you have positive evidence for an intelligent cause, then you can at least be open to the fact that the effect you're seeing was caused by intelligence.

Well, it turns out that intelligent design, or Christianity, is not a science stopper, atheism is. Why? Because atheists, for many years, and even some Christians, even some Christian people who are evolutionists, thought that much of the code that is in every one of your 40 trillion cells was what's called, junk DNA. Only 2% of your DNA codes for proteins. They thought the other 98% was junk leftover from the trial and error process of natural selection that gave us our DNA. Intelligent Design theorists were saying, no, this looks like it's a product of intelligence. And they realized that the non-coding regions of DNA, the 98% that don't code for proteins, actually, that region is actually doing something in your body. In fact, for example, that non-coding region will turn things on and off in your cells. And so, the Intelligent Design theorists are thinking, wow, if this non-coding region can turn things on and off in our cells, in fact, if this non-coding region actually controls what a cell does, maybe if we could get into this non-coding

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

region, we could turn things on and off in the cell and maybe even cure cancer. I mean, if we could turn off cancer cells, we could cure cancer, right.

So, all the intelligent design people are investigating the non-coding region to try and discover a cure for cancer, while the evolutionists are going, no, that's just junk DNA. That's just trial and error of natural selection. What's the science stopper here? The science stopper here is, assuming intelligence isn't part of the effect. The people who are open to intelligence are actually trying to find a cure for cancer by looking through what isn't junk DNA, it's the non-coding region, and it is actually performing functions in your cells. So, this obviously goes counter to what you hear in the culture that, oh, it's just those intelligent design people, or those creationists out there, or those Christians who are stopping science. No, they're not stopping science at all. They're the ones that are actually pursuing the evidence where the evidence leads.

And in fact, my friend, Stephen Meyer, who, as you know, has written some great books on science and evolution. We're going to have him on the program here shortly, because his brand new book, *The God Hypothesis*, is coming out very soon. I have an advanced copy of it. I'm going through it right now. And I'll tell you, Meyer does a great job of pointing out how, not only were the sciences founded by Christians, the sciences only makes sense if there's a mind behind the universe. And then he points out the evidence we have for this. Some of it we've just touched on briefly here; the evidence from cosmology, the evidence from biology, the evidence that, from these areas of fine tuning in biology and in the universe, we actually have evidence for a personal God. And so, we'll have him on here shortly to discuss that, so keep an eye out for that.

But in any event, we're about out of time here. If you're listening to this before the Saturday, the sixth of March, I'm in Little Rock, Arkansas at a youth conference. Check our website, [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org), if you're in that area. We'd love to see you. Next week I'm going to be down in Georgia at Influencers Church near Atlanta. Check the website out for that. And I hope, Lord willing, I'll see you here next week. God bless. See you next time.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**

