

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

## **Why did God create people He knew would go to Hell? And More**

### **Q&A**

(February 25, 2022)

Why did God create people he knew would go to hell? Why does the Creator have to be personal? Can't it be an impersonal force that created the universe? How can we defend the odd laws in the Old Testament? Why believe in a Trinity, why not believe that God operates in modes, sometimes he's the father, sometimes he's the son sometimes he's the Holy Spirit? What happens to our souls when we die? Is there any evidence we live on after we die, even independent of the Bible? These are some of the questions that you have emailed me at Hello@CrossExamined.org. I hope we get to all of them today. We haven't done a Q&A show in a while, so if you haven't been listening to our podcast, every once in a while I asked for questions and sometimes you send questions to Hello@CrossExamined.org. So, today is the day we're going to go through some of the questions you've sent in. We try and get to many of the questions unfortunately, we can't get to all of them, but if you do want to send a question just send it to Hello@CrossExamined.org.

Now, you're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network, about 180 stations across the United States. AFA is a great organization. I'm pleased to be with AFA. I think we started this radio program, I want to say, back in like 2008. And for those of you that don't know, it is on Saturday mornings at 10:00am EST / 9:00am CST around the country. And also, the podcast is called I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. Our website is CrossExamined.org.

Let's dive into our first question. The first question comes from Dan, who writes in, and he says, "Since God knew before He created man that many would reject Him and be destined for their chosen destination of hell, would he not have been better off not creating those people at all? Maybe not him, but those people would be better off uncreated anyway?"

Dan, great question. Whenever you get a question you want to test or at least identify the assumptions underneath the question. It turns out, there are several assumptions underneath

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

this question. Notice that a moral standard is assumed in this question. It's making the case, at least in the question, it's implying that God is somehow immoral if he creates people he knew would go to hell. What being would do that? Now this presupposes a moral standard. It presupposes that it would be wrong to do such a thing. Okay? Now, if this is coming from an atheist, you might ask the atheist who brings this up: By what moral standard are you claiming that this would be wrong for God to do, assuming that the objection is true? Now, I'm not saying the objection is true. I'm not saying that God does this, and it would be better off if he didn't create them. I'm not saying that. But even if you assume that that's true, how are you as an atheist claiming that God is somehow immoral for doing this? Because you don't have any moral standard, no objective moral standard anyway.

You might have your own personal standard that you say this is wrong but it's not objective if God doesn't exist. This is why in the book, *Stealing from God*, we talk about this quite a bit that atheists are stealing an objective moral standard to complain about God. In fact, one point I try and make is that most of the time when I'm debating atheists, atheists don't have arguments for their worldview, they just have complaints about the way God is running the universe. Well, he's allowing too much evil, or he's against certain sexual behaviors that we're for, or he doesn't show himself enough, he doesn't write his name in the sky and tell us he's there. These kinds of objections.

And those are complaints about the way God is running the universe. But it's not a positive case that atheism is true. You say, well, how can you make a positive case that atheism is true? Isn't atheism just a lack of belief? We've covered this on this program before. No, it's not a lack of belief, it's the positive belief that no God exists and that certain realities can be explained without any reference to a deity. Like somehow the universe can be explained without reference to a deity. Or the fine-tuning can be explained without reference to a deity. Or a moral standard can be explained without reference to a deity. Or life can be explained without reference to a deity. I mean, atheists come up with all sorts of explanations they think that can fill the causal gap that they have that oh, maybe the universe is a result of a quantum fluctuation in the quantum vacuum. Of course, they can't explain where the quantum vacuum came from. Or life got here by some sort of non-intelligent process, just by natural laws. You don't need a divine being. Of course, that presupposes that life exists to begin with, because no one has a natural explanation for the first life. It also presupposes the existence of these natural

**CROSS**  
**EXAMINED**  
**ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

laws that drive this process forward. So, atheists, despite claiming they have a lack of belief, often have positive ways of explaining how the universe can be the way it is in the absence of God. Now, I don't think any of those reasons work, but they are putting forth some reasons to believe that God doesn't exist because all this can be explained without reference to God. Here are the other explanations, okay.

Now, if you're going to say that God is somehow immoral for creating people that he knows will go to hell, you have to have a standard, number one. Number two, you're assuming that going to hell is somehow unjust and that people who go to hell get more punishment than they deserve. Why do you think that's true? Well, it's eternal punishment, Frank. Isn't it wrong to have eternal punishment for a temporal sin? Well, it depends on what you mean by that. Here's a couple of questions you might want to ask. Does the length of the punishment have to be congruent with the length of the time it took to commit the crime? For example, if it takes you two seconds to murder someone, should you only serve a sentence that is two seconds long? Well no, obviously not. The sentence is quite often much longer, usually always longer, than the length of the time it took you to commit the crime. And a crime against an infinite being, an unending being might require an unending punishment.

Not only that, but who says you stop sinning when you're in hell? You're just continually against God. As Jesus said, this is a place where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth, which implies that you're still in rebellion against God. So, the sins that you commit while you're here on earth continue in eternity, it seems, which might be the reason why the punishment continues. Regardless of any of that, since God is the very standard of justice, it would be impossible for him to be unjust in the afterlife. While we don't understand all the qualities and aspects of the afterlife, not only of hell, but also of heaven, God says through Paul that you can't imagine what God has prepared for those that love Him. We can only get analogies of heaven, we can't get a full comprehension of heaven this side of eternity, just like we can't get a full comprehension of what hell is like this side of eternity. But whatever those two destinations are, we know in one case, heaven, it will be grace, and in another case, hell, it will be justice. And that justice by definition, since God is just, will be perfectly just. Nobody will get more or less punishment than they deserve. So, the question assumes many things that need to be unpacked and we'll unpack them further right after the break.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). We also have an app you want to avail yourself of. Two words in the App Store, Cross Examined. It has this podcast, our TV shows, streaming, a bunch of other great stuff. We're back in two minutes. Don't go anywhere.

Welcome back to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. This weekend I am just north of Minneapolis, Minnesota, where it is cold ladies and gentlemen. I'll be at Lakes Free Church in Lindstrom, Minnesota, Saturday and Sunday, the 26th and 27th. We're doing an apologetics conference there; me, and Charlie Campbell, and David Clark there on the 26th. And then I'll be speaking in the morning services on the 27th. I think there'll be other events going on the 27th as well, from Dr. Clark and Charlie Campbell. You may want to avail yourselves of that. Go to our website, [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org), click on Events, you'll see it there. And then week after next Ohio State University on March 8. And then Freedom House Church here in Charlotte on March 13. University of Utah March 14 and Boise State University March 15.

A little bit further down the road I want you guys to know that one of the best apologetics conferences in the country is again here near Charlotte, North Carolina, put on by our friends at Southern Evangelical Seminary (SES). It begins Friday, April 8, and goes to Saturday, April 9. A lot of great speakers will be there: J. Warner Wallace, Gary Habermas, Alisa Childers, even John Cooper from Skillet, and many others. I'll be there as well. Go to [SES.edu](http://SES.edu), Click on national conference at the top of the page, you'll see it there. So, don't miss that conference here near Charlotte, North Carolina. It's actually in Rock Hill, SC.

Alright, today we are talking about a number of questions and we're diving into the first question. Basically, the question is: Why does God create people he knew would go to hell? We've already pointed out there's a couple of assumptions underneath this question. Also, another assumption that people make when they say this is, they assume that God can create free creatures who will always do what he wants. In other words, when you say: Why does God create people he knew would go to hell?, you're almost saying: Well, why doesn't God just create people who all go to heaven? Well, if he could, he would, but if they're going to be free creatures, in other words, they have the capacity to love...and that's why he gives us

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

freedom...they can also have the capacity to hate or to reject. So, it might be logically possible that God can create everybody who does believe but it might not be actually achievable with free creatures. It might be that, you know, after God creates a few people, the third or fourth one is definitely going to sin. Is therefore then God obligated to not create anything because some people freely decide not to follow him? It doesn't appear to me that God is obligated not to create because some reject God.

So, people say, well, God is all powerful, yes, he's all powerful to do what is logically possible, but he's not all powerful to do illogical things, because logic is grounded in his nature and he can't contradict his nature. He can't create a square circle, he can't create a one-ended stick, he can't create a married bachelor, he can't create an honest politician. I mean, there are some things that are just too hard for God because they go against logic, which is part of his nature. He can't lie, he can't go out of existence, and he can't create free creatures whom he forces to do what he wants.

And by the way, Calvinism doesn't help here either. Why? Because on one hand, the hard five-point Calvinists are saying that God makes all the choices, yet on the other hand, you read in the Scriptures that God wants everybody to be saved. Well, if God makes all the choices, and he wants everybody to be saved, then why isn't everyone saved? Because God doesn't make all the choices. In other words, our free choice to follow him or not follow Him. He knows what we're going to do but he's not forcing us to do it. He knows everything even before we do it, but that doesn't mean he's causing us to do it, as I've pointed out in this program several times before. Knowledge does not imply causation. A mother putting her baby down at night knows that sometime during the night that baby is gonna wake up and want to eat, but her knowing that doesn't mean she's causing it to happen. And God knowing what we're going to do doesn't mean he's causing us to do it. He knows we're going to do it but he's not causing us to do it.

So yes, God could have created a universe where nobody existed, just a dead universe. He could have created no universe. He could have created a universe of robots but that wouldn't be similar to ours either. If he creates a universe of free creatures, then he has to allow free creatures to be free if he wants free creatures. He just can't decide what to do with them, because then therefore they wouldn't be free. He can't decide for them what they're going to do, they wouldn't be free, they wouldn't have the ability to love, or the ability to reject if they

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

don't have free will. So, God can't create a universe, at least not an achievable universe, it seems, where everyone believes. Because, again, if people have freedom, they can choose not to believe, and that's the universe he seems to have created. Also, when you say: Why doesn't God create people that he knew would go to hell? Or why did God create people he knew would go to hell? I think what people are missing when they think about that question is, they might not realize that everything is connected, that there's a ripple effect. That if you're listening to me right now, and you're a believer, you wouldn't even be alive without atheists.

You say, well, how can that be, Frank? Well, I'm sure there are atheists, or at least non-Christians in your bloodline, right. You wouldn't be here without them. And in fact, God can get his will done, even by allowing people to be atheists, or allowing people to do evil. For example, the famous atheist Richard Dawkins, he writes a book called, *The God Delusion*, which, by the way, is a well-written book, but not a philosophically sound book. It doesn't have good reasons not to believe in God and many people have pointed this out. Dawkins is a great writer, but he's not a good philosopher. In any event, Dawkins writes the book, a Christian picks it up and reads it, and goes, oh, I hadn't heard that argument against God and it causes the Christian to study more to learn more about God as a result of what Richard Dawkins has written. So, here's a case where an atheist is doing what he wants to do, and it actually causes a Christian to become closer to God.

There's a ripple effect there and that's true in everything we do. There are trillions of events that happened before you ever took your first breath, trillions of ripples that came forward to bring you to where you are now. And God being outside of time knows where all those ripples go and what they do. And it could be, and I think it is, that God even gets his will done by allowing people to do evil. In fact, God guarantees that to those that love God, and are called according to His purpose, that all things will work together for good. All things will work together for good. Notice he has to say all things are good, he says all things work together for good. So yes, God creates people he knows are going to go to hell, but they're freely going to hell on their own, and what they do actually all fits into God's plan. And the punishment that they get is absolutely perfect. It's no more no less than what they should get, even if we don't completely understand it. And of course, we won't. We're finite creatures.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

There's one other thing that I think this moral objection brings up and that is, it assumes that you could compare something with nothing. Like when Dan asked the question: Wouldn't someone have been better off if they hadn't been created? Well, you can't really make that comparison. You're already thinking in your head, oh, wait a minute, doesn't Jesus say that it would have been better if Judas had never been born? Yeah, he does say that, but Jesus isn't making a philosophical point there. What he's doing is he's using hyperbole to communicate the gravity of Judas' sin. He was not literally making a philosophical comparison to say that non-existence is better than existence. Existing and going to hell cannot be compared with not existing, because not existing is nothing.

I mean, you can compare apples and oranges, they're both fruit, but you can't compare apples to nothing because there's nothing to compare. So, technically, it's not philosophically sound, it's not a good question to say: Would it have been better off for these people not to have been created? Because non-existence can't be compared to existence? Alright, now, I know that's a philosophical point, but it also is one way to understand this question. At the end of the day, we know that God is going to be completely just to people who do not accept His free gift of salvation and he's going to be gracious to those that do.

Remember, there's only three things you can get in life and there's only three things you can get in eternity. You can get justice, which is getting what you deserve, you can get mercy, which is not getting what you deserve, or you can get grace, which is getting what you don't deserve. And the people who go to hell will get justice. The people that go to heaven will first get mercy, they will not get what they deserve, and then they will get grace, they will get what they don't deserve. What don't we deserve? We don't deserve getting the righteousness of Christ. God gives us that freely as a gift. That's Christianity. It's not just that you're forgiven, what you're given his righteousness. So, those are some things to think about.

By the way, going back to the Calvinism issue, we have a whole podcast on this. I want to say it's from...you gotta go back in the archive, you got to get the app to do this. Two words in the App Store, Cross Examined. Go back to August of 2018. I think that's when we did a whole show on the Calvinism issue, Romans nine and all that, so go back and listen to that if you want more on this. But look, I think God is so sovereign that he can get his will done through our free will. If you think God isn't powerful enough to get his will done through our free will, then you don't

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      **PODCAST**

believe in the sovereignty of God enough, in my view. You know, Calvinists are always saying, we believe in the sovereignty of God. No, I don't think you do. I think you're saying that you've got to hamstringing human beings in order to help God get what he wants done. No, you don't need to hamstringing human beings. God can still get his ultimate will done through our free will. And one of his wills is that he allows free creatures to make their own choices, because in order to have love, you gotta have freewill.

Now, that also, as we know, opens up the possibility for evil. But God thinks that that's worth doing. That's worth doing. Giving people the ability to make choices makes this a real moral universe. And love, it's worth it to give people free choice so love can exist. That's what God has decided to do. Alright, we're gonna get into the next question: Why does the Creator have to be personal?, right after the break. [unintelligible] Can't an impersonal force create the universe? We'll cover that right after the break and try and get to some of those other ones. Don't go anywhere. You're listening to me, Frank Turek, on the show I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist on the American Family Radio Network. Back in two.

If you're low on the FM dial looking for National Public Radio, go no further, we're actually going to tell you the truth here. That's our intent anyway. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org).

Today, we're taking some of the questions that you've emailed me, you can email questions at [Hello@CrossExamined.org](mailto:Hello@CrossExamined.org). And here's what Chris writes in... Chris has been in several of our online courses. He's a young man and going to college right now and here's what he writes. "I'm in my philosophy of religion class and my professor is saying that the cause of the universe doesn't have to be personal. So, I asked him, why not? And he said that there could be something that creates things just because that's its nature to just produce, therefore, the cause doesn't necessarily have to be God. I'm trying to comprehend this, and I think what is wrong with it? Can you help me out here? Thank you so much."

Okay. Well, first of all, it was good, Chris, that you initially asked him basically the question: Well, how did you come to that conclusion? Or, what do you mean by that? You always have to do that when people make a statement. I don't think he successfully answered that question

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

because all he did was he just said that there could be something that creates things just because it's its nature to do so. So, my next question would be: Well, what do you know that has a nature to just produce things out of nothing? Do you know anything that does that? What would that be? What qualities would such a cause have to have to create a universe out of nothing, and not just a universe out of nothing, but a universe with extremely fine-tuned parameters? What kind of cause would that have to be because we don't know of anything, first of all, that can create out of nothing in our experience? We know there's nothing we know about that does that. We don't know anything that does it as part of its nature. And it's not personal. There's nothing in our experience that causes us to believe that things exist just to produce, say, universes out of nothing. And they're not personal.

The only thing we know that can choose to do something, to go from a state of nothingness to a state of creation, is intelligence, a mind. Because look, to go from nothingness, nothing, no space, no matter no time...Aristotle had a good definition of nothing. He said nothing is what rocks dream about. There's non-being there. There's no there there. There's no space, matter, or time and then the universe explodes into being out of nothing in an extremely fine-tuned way. The only thing we know about that could do anything like that would be a mind, an intelligence of some kind, that can make a choice. You see, natural forces don't make choices. Impersonal forces don't make choices. Gravity doesn't decide that it's gonna pull things to the ground. I know that's not their technical way of saying it, due to general relativity, but you get the idea. Gravity, at least the effect of gravity is that all things go to the ground if you're here on earth. Well, gravity doesn't decide, well, I'm going to pull this book to the ground, but not this pencil, right. Gravity is not making decisions; gravity just does the same thing over and over again.

But to go from nothingness to a state of creation, some person had to make a choice, some being with the ability to make choices. Seems like the best explanation of the creation of the universe. And what we mean by personal in this context is the ability to make choices, to choose between unique alternatives and to create unique effects, like a highly fine-tuned universe. For example, as Stephen Hawking has famously said that, if the expansion rate of the universe a second after the Big Bang was different, by one part in 1000 million million, the universe would have collapsed back on itself or never developed galaxies. Now, you can't make any sort of natural explanation for that. Why? Because nature didn't exist. You can't make any

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

sort of evolutionary explanation for that because the expansion rate didn't evolve to that point. The expansion rate started there. Seems to me, the same being that created space, matter, and time out of nothing, is the same being that had to have the intelligence to fine-tune the expansion rate to that level of precision.

You know, there are constants about our universe that are fine-tuned to such extreme precision that it strains credulity to say that this happened by some sort of natural process without intelligence. For example, one of the parameters is the ratio of the weight of the proton to the neutron. It's fine tuned to 1 in 10 to the 37th power. That's one part in one with 37 zeros following it. One part in one with 37 zeros following it.

You say Frank, I can't get my head around that number. Okay, let me give you an illustration of that number that Hugh Ross gave. And by the way, Hugh Ross is going to be at this conference here near Charlotte in April, the one put out by SES (SES.edu). Anyway, Hugh Ross says, pile dimes on the continent of North America all the way to the moon, which is like over 230,000 miles. Pile them all the way to the moon and do that on a billion other North Americas, dimes all the way to the moon. Then mark one of those dimes red, mix it up in those billion North Americas piled all the way to the moon, and then blindfold somebody, throw him in any one of those piles, and the odds of him blindly picking out the one red dime would be one chance in one with 37 zeros following it. That's one in 10 to the 37th precision. And that's just one factor of like a dozen factors, constants about our universe. Change any one of them, we don't exist.

Now, how does a non-personal, non-intelligent force choose that level of precision? It doesn't. It's the whole point. You need a personal intelligent being to do this. And by the way, the cosmological argument doesn't actually give you the God of Christianity. You don't get all the way to Jesus from the cosmological argument. But you do get what appear to be six attributes of a Creator God because if space, matter, and time had a beginning, which is what the evidence show, then whatever created space, matter, and time can't be made of space, matter, and time. So, the cause must be spaceless, that's one attribute; timeless, that's the second attribute; immaterial, the third attribute because it created all material; powerful to create the universe out of nothing, that's the fourth attribute; personal, in order to choose to create, as we've been explaining here; also intelligent, to have a mind in order to make a choice, that's the sixth attribute.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now ladies and gentlemen, when you think about a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent, cause, who do you think of? You think of God, right? But it doesn't have to be the Christian God, it could be Allah. In fact, you know what, this could actually be just the deistic God. This could be a God who just creates the universe with his intelligence, winds it up, and then leaves it. And by the way, even the famous atheist Richard Dawkins says that one could make a good case for this deistic God. It's not one that he would personally accept but he admits that, yeah, you could make a case for this. In fact, he even said this on two different occasions in his debate with John Lennox. They debated a couple of times. If you go to YouTube and type in, "Has Science Buried God Debate, Richard Dawkins, John Lennox", you can see their exchange. And I'm just gonna play for you right now, two very short clips of Dawkins admitting this. So, let's play the tape right now. Here it is.

Richard Dawkins: "We could take a deist God, just sort of god of the physicists, the God of somebody like Paul Davies, who devised the laws of physics. God the mathematician, God who put together the cosmos in the first place and then sat back and watched everything happen. And that would be...the god would be one that I think it would be, one could make a reasonably respectable case for that. Not a case that I would accept but I think it is a serious discussion that we could have. You could possibly persuade me that there was some kind of creative force in the universe, there was some kind of physical mathematical genius who created everything, the expanding universe, devised quantum theory, relativity, and all that. You could possibly persuade me of that."

That's Richard Dawkins. By the way, he mentioned Paul Davies in there. Paul Davies is an agnostic cosmologist from Arizona State University. He's written a number of books, even on fine-tuning. He's not a believer, but he points out that universe is highly fine-tuned. And he calls, by the way, the multiverse a dodge to try and get around the fine-tuning that, you know, there are all these other universes out there that just happen to exist even though we can't detect anything about them. And ours just happens to be the one that appears to be designed. Well, he says that's a dodge. Nobody would be bringing up multiple universes that we can't detect unless the universe did appear to be so fine-tuned, i.e., so finely designed, because design is the best explanation for the fine-tuning.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now, here is Dawkins in his debate with John Lennox. And again, you can see the entire debate to show I'm not taking this out of context. That's what he really believes, you could make a case for deism. Well, that's what the cosmological argument gets you, a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent, cause. It doesn't say that God is loving, doesn't say that God is the moral standard, it doesn't say that God intervened later in the universe through life, creating life, or Jesus, or any of these things, resurrecting Jesus. No, that's what the argument gets you. Now, when you add those other arguments in, the moral argument, and the arguments from the resurrection and others, then you get the Christian God. But why is it that somebody like Richard Dawkins is so, at least open maybe, to a deistic God but not a theistic God? Well, I'm only speculating here but I think I know the answer. Because a deistic God does not bring morality, but a theistic God does...a theistic God that says, well, you ought to live this way and not this way.

That's why when people protest too much that God exists, I'm really wondering, why are you so emotional about the existence of God? You're not emotional about a deistic God, but you are emotional about a theistic God. Seems to me, because God, a theistic God anyway, might not want you to do what you really want to do. He might be the authority in life, and you really want to be the authority. That's why when I ask people: If Christianity were true would you become a Christian?, and they say, no, the issue is not in the head, the issue is in the heart. Alright, we're gonna go a little further with this and get to some other questions right after the break. You're listening to me, Frank Turek, on the show, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, here on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). We're back in two.

Frank Turek with you ladies and gentlemen. We're talking about this question: Why does the being that created the universe have to be personal? And we're just finishing up the answer to that. Here's one thing you can say to people who try and say, well, you know, it could just be a natural cause. Well, no, it can't be a natural cause because if all nature had a beginning it's got to be something beyond nature. It's got to be something super nature. And even if you were to try and suggest it was a natural cause that created the universe, that's impossible, as I just said, because nature had a beginning. But even if you were to say there's this blind force out there that just creates, you can't go on an infinite regress of blind natural causes. You're ultimately going to terminate at an uncaused intelligent personal first cause. Matter is not ultimate reality;

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

mind is ultimate reality. Look, there's only two choices; either matter gave rise to mind or mind gave rise to matter. Well, we know matter had a beginning, we know matter runs down, we know matter by itself is dumb. We know matter, by the way, is also composed, and if it's composed, all things that are composed are composed by something outside of itself.

This is why by the way, God has to be simple, meaning he has no parts. Because if he's composed, then he needs a composer, but since he is the composer of all other things, he is the uncomposed composer. Because you can't go on a regress of composer after composer after composer. Eventually, you're going to get back to an uncomposed composer. Eventually, you're going to back to an uncreated Creator. Eventually, you're going to get back to some being who is outside of time. And by the way, if you're outside of time, do you have a cause? No. If you're timeless, you don't have a beginning, which means you don't have a cause. You are the uncaused first cause.

So, there are a number of ways of answering this question, Chris. But again, I would go back to your professor and ask him those questions from the book Tactics. What do you mean by that? How do you come to that conclusion? How can nothingness give rise to something unless someone makes a choice? How does that happen? A mind has to make a choice to bring a universe into existence. And even if you're going to say that this universe was created by some other universe, well, what created that universe. You're going to ultimately get back to an uncaused first cause that's outside of any physicality, outside of any composition.

Alright, got to move on to other questions. This question is from Brian, and he asked a question about a former podcast that highlighted a book about understanding odd Bible verses. And the answer is from a little over a year ago. We had Dan Kimball on. A great book that he wrote called, How Not to Read the Bible. Check it out because there are odd laws, certainly in the Old Testament, that we don't understand in our culture. You know, laws that only applied to ancient Israel, like don't eat shellfish and don't wear mixed fabrics and these kinds of things. We're going, why? What does that have to do with...? And people today mock that. Let me ask you this ladies and gentlemen. Does this sound like a law you should mock? Did you know that...I don't know how long this was, maybe 150 or so years ago...that there was a law on the books in Lexington, Kentucky that said you can't carry an ice cream cone in your back pocket and walk through town? That would be illegal. That would be against the law. Now why?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Doesn't that seem stupid? Doesn't that seem like an odd law? You can't carry an ice cream cone in your back pocket and walk through town. Can't do it and Lexington, Kentucky at least you couldn't do it 150 or so years ago. Why not? That's odd. We don't get it. We have no context for this. We're going, that's stupid. And if that was in the Bible, we'd go, that's stupid. How does that make any sense?

Until you realize that the reason that law was put into place is that horse thieves would just put an ice cream cone in their back pocket and walk through town and any horse that was not secured would follow the person right out of town trying to lick the ice cream cone. And then the thief could just get on the horse and ride away. Okay, now you know why that law was in place you go, you know, that wasn't such a bad law. I get it now. It prevented people from stealing horses. Okay, that makes sense now, but without that knowledge you go, that's dumb.

Well, I submit to you, do you believe that there are many things in the Old Testament that atheists and skeptics point out that they have no concept as to why that law was put into place, and that's why they're mocking it, when if they really knew why it was put into place they might go, you know, that might make sense now? Yeah, before you try and criticize something maybe you ought to get some background information, maybe to get some context. And that's what Dan Kimball's book, *How Not to Read the Bible*, will do for you. And so will Paul Copan's book, *Is God a Moral Monster?*. You need some context to understand the why behind some of these laws. Now, sometimes the why isn't explained but that doesn't mean that God doesn't have a good reason for it. Okay? So, check out that book, *How Not to Read the Bible*, by Dan Kimball. And he it covers a lot of other issues, too, that we don't seem to understand until we get the background information. In fact, Dan used that law in the book, the Lexington, Kentucky law about not carrying an ice cream cone in your back pocket.

Alright. Here's another question. This is from Daniel. And Daniel writes, My wife believes Jesus died for our sins and rose bodily on the third day. The problem is she believes Jesus is the Father and the Holy Spirit as well as being the son, some kind of oneness or modalism, I guess. She grew up in the United Pentecostal church, if that helps clarify things. Does this make us unequally yoked? Again, I want a successful marriage. I'm just summing up the question, he had written more than this. I want a successful marriage and I'm not looking for a way out but following God is my top priority in life. How can I convince her of God's existence in three

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

persons? Thank you, for all your help in giving us insight into God's word. It has been life changing for me.

Well, thank you so much, Daniel. I don't know if anything's going to convince her. All you can do is give her reasons. Okay. Here's one question you might ask, for people who believe God is in modes, that there isn't a trinity, but God manifests himself in different ways. Sometimes he's the father, sometimes he's the son, sometimes he's the Holy Spirit. Here's the question. If God is in different modes, did that mean that when Jesus died on the cross heaven was empty? Because if that's what you mean, that wouldn't make any sense, right. No, God is not in different modes. In fact, there are times in the Bible where the three persons of the Trinity are in the same place, so to speak, or appear at the same time, like at Jesus's baptism. Jesus is there, the Holy Spirit descends on Jesus like a dove, and you can hear the Father saying, this is my son with whom I'm well pleased. So, you've got the three persons operating at the same time, in the same place. So, God wasn't in three different modes, he was there in his three persons all at once.

And we could go through several passages that talk about the Trinity. In fact, that's one of them. Another would be the great commission Go therefore make disciples of all nations. Notice he doesn't say make believers; he says make disciples. There's a difference. Make disciples of all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In fact, the Holy Spirit has attributes of God too. In Acts chapter five when Ananias and Sapphira grieve the Holy Spirit. You lied to the Holy Spirit. They are told, you lied to the Holy Spirit. Well, how can you lie to just an electric force? Or how could you lie to a being that wasn't a person? You can't. You can only lie to persons...the Holy Spirit isn't people, so to speak, but he's person all. In other words, he is mind, emotion, and will. He can understand. So, you don't lie to just a force. If you lie, you lie to a person. That's why it's grievous. That's why you can grieve the Holy Spirit because the Holy Spirit is God as well. The Holy Spirit has a will and you're grieving the will of the Holy Spirit. Forces don't have wills in that sense. So, all three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are all equally God and they are yet one God. They share one essence, one divine essence, but there are three persons in one divine essence.

And by the way, this explains so much actually. Because think about this, before God ever created, how could he be a loving being if there's nothing to love, if he's just a strictly

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

monotheistic being as say, the Muslims claim? There can't be love in a strictly monotheistic being, there's nobody to love. But if there's a trinity, if there's three persons in one divine essence, then you can have a lover, a loved one, and a spirit of love. You can have love from all eternity. And God did. He didn't have to create, he didn't need to create, he wasn't lonely. He chose to create to create other creatures so he could share his love.

Also, you can give evidence that Jesus is God. Jesus did have two natures, right. He had a human nature and a divine nature. But he certainly had a divine nature. I mean, imagine if a friend of yours said some of the things that Jesus said. Suppose your friend said, before Abraham was born, I am. Or he said, your sins are forgiven. Or I and the Father are one. Or all authority in heaven and earth has been given to me. Or whoever obeys My Word will never see death. Or I am the resurrection in the life. Or no one comes to the Father except through me. Or I am the light of the world. Or whoever follows me will never walk in darkness. Or I am the bread of life. Or can you prove me guilty of sin? Or if your friend said, pray in my name? Or what if your friend said, Father, glorify me with the glory I had with you before the world began? Would you say well, this guy is just a great moral teacher, he's not really god. No. You would say, this guy is nuts, or he is God, but I need some proof.

Look, there's evidence, obviously, the Father is God, there's evidence that the Son is God, that Jesus is God, and there's evidence that the Holy Spirit is God. So, there is a trinity and if there's a trinity that modalism is false. So, do your best to explain this. In fact, one of the best chapters on the trinity, believe it or not, comes from Dr. Geisler's book on Islam. It's called, Answering Islam, and I highly recommend you get that book.

We'll get to more questions another time. Again friends, if you have questions, send them to [Hello@CrossExamined.org](mailto:Hello@CrossExamined.org). Don't forget we got a new course coming up called Jesus Versus the Culture. It's 23 hours of video. Go to our website, [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org), click on Online Courses, you'll see it there. And I'll see you here next week, Lord willing. God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**

