

Is There Scientific Evidence for the Resurrection?

(March 31, 2023)

Frank:

Can you get all your truth from science, ladies and gentlemen? As a result of last week's program, where we went through the evidence that the universe had a beginning, I got an email from a listener by the name of Mike, who is asking for scientific evidence for the resurrection of Jesus. I'll get to it in just a minute.

But just to review what we did last week, I mentioned that I don't get a chance to really delve into these arguments for God in any great detail when I go to a college or a church, because I'm really trying to cover the entire argument for Christianity, from truth, to God, to New Testament, or truth, God, miracles, New Testament. And so, you can't spend a whole lot of time on any one argument. So, last week, we spent most of the program on the cosmological argument and the evidence that the universe had a beginning.

And Mike writes in and says, "Listened again this morning and continue to enjoy your logic and science based arguments for an uncaused cause creator. I'm totally on board with your S.U.R.E. arguments." Let me stop right here for those of you that didn't listen to last week. Why not? Go back and listen, anyway. [laughter]

We used an acronym S.U.R.E., to show that the universe had a beginning. The S stands for the Second Law of Thermodynamics. The U stands for the fact that the universe is expanding. The R stands for the radiation afterglow of the Big Bang explosion itself. And E stands for Einstein's theory of General Relativity. And we also added the argument that there can't be an infinite number of days before today. If there were an infinite number of days before today, today, never would have gotten here. So, there must have been a beginning to the universe. If there was a beginning to the universe, and a beginning to time, then whatever created space, time and matter, we said had to be spaceless, timeless...

And by the way, if you're timeless, do you have a beginning? Do you have a cause? No. If you're timeless, you are the uncaused first cause. So, the question "who made God?" makes no sense. Because if the creator of time is God, as the evidence seems to indicate, then He is the uncaused first cause. In any event, if space, matter, and time had a beginning, then whatever created space, matter, and time, must be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, and intelligent. We went through this last week. So, you can go back to the show and listen to it if you want to go further, or get the book, "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist." Or you can get "Stealing from God" or "Hollywood Heroes: How Your Favorite Movies Reveal God." We covered those arguments in all those books.



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

So, Mike goes on to say, "I'm on board with your S.U.R.E. arguments. And I can also buy your argument that the first passage of Genesis does not necessarily conflict with the Big Bang Theory." Well, maybe the theory, which doesn't give you a cause. It just says the universe exploded into being out of nothing. We're saying that if space, matter, and time had a beginning, there has to be a cause that's spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal and intelligent. Anyway, a little bit further down. Mike says, "you say that Christianity depends on the fact that Jesus rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, wherever that is. Where can I find your logic and science-based support for that, as you so wonderfully lay out for the uncaused cause creator argument, which I support?"

And he said, "And if the creator is timeless, spaceless, and immaterial, is there a logic and science-based argument for personifying that entity as a human man? Say, a father or something like that?" Okay. The question really boils down to, can you get science-based arguments for everything in history? And we'll talk about that here today. First of all, it appears that Mike might be someone that thinks that just about all the evidence, or I should say all the truth you can get, must come from science. Now, as we pointed out on this program before, that's called scientism. Scientism is the belief that you get all your truth from science. The problem, of course, with that is that it's self-defeating. Because if somebody says, all truth comes from science, you just need to ask them, did that truth come from science, that all truth comes from science? No.

The truth claim that all truth comes from science, is actually a philosophical claim. It is not a statement of science. It is statement about science, and you can't do science without philosophy. Science is built on philosophy. All human endeavors to discover knowledge are built on philosophy. When you get a PhD, the Ph does not stand for phenomenally dumb. It stands for philosophy. Philosophy of physics, of biology, of history of whatever it is. Philosophy undergirds all disciplines of academic thought. You can't know anything without assuming certain philosophical principles, such as the laws of logic and assuming that your senses are telling you the truth. Assuming there's a real world out there, that you're not imagining everything. These are assumptions that you make in order to do science.

You can't prove these things by science. You need them in order to do science. You need the laws of logic. Often, you need the laws of mathematics. You need your senses. You have to assume they're reliable. You have to assume that the laws of logic are useful and applicable to the real world. These are all assumptions that you have to make in order to do science. So, the laws of logic, the laws of mathematics, the reliability of your senses, those are all assumptions you make. And you have to get data from your senses in order to do science. So, you don't get all of your evidence, or I should say all your truth from science. That would be impossible. And in the book "Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case", we have an entire chapter on science, because science is one of the areas that atheists steal from God, in my view anyway. They try and say that science points away from God, when in fact, it would be impossible to do science unless there was a God. And we'll unpack that a little bit later in the program here, I hope.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

But the title of the chapter is, "Science Doesn't Say Anything. Scientists do." Why do I say that? Because all data needs to be gathered, and all data needs to be interpreted. And who does that? Scientists do that. I mean, you have to gather data, you have to interpret the data. That's not done by science, that's done by scientists. And as I normally ask audiences today, do you ever wonder why you get conflicting advice on COVID? Yeah, why? Because scientists say different things based on assumptions they've made. And look, all data needs to be gathered. All data needs to be interpreted, and scientists do that. If scientists have good data, and they interpret it properly, you'll get good advice. If they have good data, but they don't interpret it properly, you're not going to get good advice.

If they have bad data, it probably doesn't matter how they interpret it, you're going to get bad advice. If there's a political agenda... Oh, that'll never happen. Why do we think, ladies and gentlemen, that scientists are immune to the same three temptations that might cause the rest of us to utter falsehoods? What are the big three? We've talked about them many times: sex, money, and power. Those are the big three motivators that can cause people to lie, that can cause people to cheat, that can cause people to steal. Actually, I shouldn't say cause. These are three conditions that motivate people. The cause is your own free will. But these are three conditions that might motivate you to lie, cheat, and steal, because you want to get sex, money, and power.

And I think now, when you look back at what's happened with the COVID situation, you notice that there's a lot of money to be made, and a lot of power to be gotten, by interpreting certain data a certain way. And as we now see, it appears anyway, the vaccines have done so much damage to so many people, that what we were told wasn't really true. And whether we knew this or not, that's another question. But science doesn't say a word. Scientists say things. Some of them honestly went on the data they thought was good. And they gave us advice, and it turned out to be bad advice. Others may have had ulterior motives. They wanted money. They wanted power. In any event, we're going to come back to this right after the break because all this relates to Mike's question. Can we get science based arguments for historical events, particularly the resurrection of Jesus? We're going to come back to it right after the break. You're listening to "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist" with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Don't go anywhere. Back in two,

Ladies and gentlemen, this Monday night, April 3, if you go to our YouTube channel or our website CrossExamined.org, at about 7:30 Eastern, you're going to see the fourth episode of "Digging up the Bible." We are going through the archaeological evidence for the entire Bible. We're still in Genesis. We're on the fourth lesson. We're looking at the most significant archaeological discoveries related to the Bible. And we just air this on YouTube and on our website, just LIVE that night. It's ultimately going to turn into a TV show. And our TV show airs on Wednesday nights at 9pm Eastern time on the NRB network. It's also on Roku. Just look for NRB on Roku, and it's streamed also on our website, CrossExamined.org on Wednesday nights. Right now, the program that's airing is our series we did through Galatians. But we're

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

recording the programs for the archaeology series. So, if you want to be a part of it, check out Monday night at 7:30pm Eastern time, April 3.

Also, note that on April 6, I'll be at Ohio State University, 7:30pm, details on the website. We're not going to be doing "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist." We're going to be doing something different called, "How to Find Hope and Identity", because that's what our culture is struggling with. So, I hope you can be a part of that. And we will livestream that. So, if you're not near Columbus, Ohio and you just want to watch it, you can watch it 7:30pm Eastern time on Thursday, April 6. Then, next Monday night, April 10, we'll be at Louisiana Christian University, doing "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist", or something similar to that. I might be doing, "If God, Why Evil?", now that I think about it.

And then we're going to be at Louisiana Christian University on the 10th. Then we're going to be at Louisiana Tech University the next day, the 11th. And while I'm down there, I'm going to meet for the first time, the great folks at the Unashamed podcast, because we're going to do the Unashamed podcast LIVE. We're going to meet Phil and Jase, and all the folks on the broadcast there. So, I'm looking forward to that. I think their podcast will air just a few days after that. So, I'm looking forward to being a part of that. Then way out on the 16th of April, I'll be at Calvary, Calvary Chapel, Lebanon. That's in Pennsylvania, not in the Middle East. So, I hope to see any of you at any of those places. Keep an eye on our calendar.

And one way, by the way, you can understand who God is, is using science to see how certain effects point back to the ultimate cause, God. We talked last week about the cosmological argument. At some point, we're going to talk about the fine-tuning argument, which is an effect. The fact that the universe is precisely fine-tuned for life here on Earth. And if the universe was just different, ever so slightly by any one of a number of parameters, we couldn't exist. That's an effect that needs to be explained by a cause. In fact, maybe we'll get to it later in the program today. We'll see how long this science objection takes.

Today, we are talking about the idea that you get all your truth from science. It's a self-defeating claim to say you do get all your truth from science, as we pointed out. And by the way, the most important truths in the world have nothing to do with science. "Honey, do you love me? Yeah. Why? I don't know, let's run an experiment." The most important things in life have nothing to do with science. Science is great. It helps us live longer. It makes us more comfortable. But science is not the most important thing in most people's lives. It's really relationships. Particularly for the Christian, and it should be for everyone, the most important relationship, is your relationship with Christ. That you've accepted the free gift that He has provided. That you're here to know God, and to make Him known.

So, one way you can know God, is by looking at the universe around you, and using science to...I think it was, who famously said that "Science is thinking God's thoughts after Him." I can't remember it right now. I'm having a senior moment, but it's one of the early founders of modern

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

science. That all they were doing, was thinking God's thoughts after Him. Seeing how God put together this universe, and how He set it up, so it runs in an orderly way.

Let me go back now to Mike's question. He says, "I'm genuinely curious for your logic and science-based arguments that supports so many of the incredible Bible stories, but most importantly, and singularly, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. I'm looking for more proof than just what's written in the Bible, and a required belief that it's the divinely inspired Word of God." Well, you don't need to assume that it's the divinely inspired Word of God to know if Jesus rose from the dead. In fact, if the Bible wasn't the inspired Word of God, it could still be telling the truth that a man died and rose again. You don't need it to be divinely inspired. In fact, in order to show that Jesus rose from the dead, we don't assume it's divinely inspired. That's a conclusion. That's not a premise. It would be circular to say, well, since it's divinely inspired, Jesus rose from the dead.

No, what we're saying is, that there's evidence from these written documents that's historically reliable. And there's evidence that they are historically reliable. And that's what we do in the book, "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist" and also "Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case." So, one of the problems of course, with answering a question like this, is the fact that you can't ask for clarifying questions. I'd like to ask Mike, when he says, I'm looking for science-based arguments to support the resurrection, my question would be, what do you mean by science-based arguments?

Are you saying that something that is science-based must be repeatable? As if in a lab? Because if that's the case, really, very little from history can be repeatable. You can't go in the lab and repeat history. Now, if you're talking about something that occurred in history that can be repeated now...Like, for example, if you put two parts hydrogen, one part oxygen together, and we got that 50 years ago...if we do it now, and we get the same thing, then we can say, Okay, I can verify that 50 years ago, when people put hydrogen and oxygen together, they got water, two parts hydrogen, one part oxygen, because we get it today. But we're still making an assumption there.

The assumption is known as the Principle of Uniformity, that causes in the past were like those in the present, that nature worked the same way in the past as it works today. But that's a philosophical assumption. You have to assume that in order to know the past. So, there are empirical events that occur over and over again. Repeatable events that we can say, using the Principle of Uniformity, that, Okay, we got water here today, we probably got water doing the same thing 50 years ago. So, in that sense, yeah, you can say, Okay, we got something repeatable. But virtually all other historical claims must be investigated in a forensic way, not in a repeatable way.

You can't go back and recreate the resurrection, just like you can't go back and recreate or watch George Washington being sworn in as the first president of the United States. The way we know history, is by eyewitness testimony and other clues that are left behind related to that.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

For example, maybe we have some sort of inscription that might help us understand what happened, or some sort of written document that can help us understand what happened. A written document might be an eyewitness account. An inscription might be something that was put down back in the day when it happened, and we just discover it now. And we say, Okay, that's evidence that this occurred. But you can't give scientific evidence in a repeatable way for events that occurred in history.

So, if Mike was here, I'd say Mike, can you give me scientific evidence of where you went to first grade? No, all you could do is give me testimony. You can't give me scientific evidence, unless maybe we could go back to your first grade classroom and find your DNA in it somewhere. But then we'd still be assuming that DNA was placed there when you were in first grade. How do we know you didn't go in there and put it there yesterday? Right? It's very difficult to affirm a historical event with scientific evidence. You can just look at clues. I mean, can you give me scientific evidence that George Washington was the first president United States? No, it's not really a scientific question. It's a question of testimony. It's a question of eyewitnesses. It's a question of people that have left clues behind. It's not a repeatable event.

You can't even give me scientific evidence that you were born at a certain time. It's all testimony. I got it on my birth certificate. That's testimony. My mom said I was born at this time. That's testimony. So, you seem to be asking for a category of evidence that doesn't fit the category of inquiry. We would call this a category mistake in logic. You're asking for a category of evidence that doesn't fit the category of inquiry. So, what you're looking for doesn't really exist. Although, there may be clues that are left behind. Here's a couple of interesting clues. It doesn't prove the resurrection, but proves, I think that somebody must have seen this because they wouldn't have known it.

For example, I think Luke mentions that Jesus sweat blood. He was in such distress in the Garden of Gethsemane. Now Luke, even though he was a medical doctor, probably didn't know this was a medical condition for him to put it in his narrative, as if he were making the narrative up. But we do now know that someone who is under extreme stress, it's a very rare condition, but could literally have blood intermingle with the person's perspiration. They would appear to literally sweat blood. That's what they were doing. How would Luke know this unless he saw it? Seems to be a good eyewitness detail.

Also, the fact that blood and water came out of the heart of Jesus. I think John records that. And we know now that a crucified victim would have the watery sack, or the sack around the heart called the pericardium, filled with a watery fluid under the duress of crucifixion. So, when the spear went into the side, blood and water came out. John may have thought it was miraculous. But in reality, it was just an eyewitness detail. How would he have known that, unless he saw it? You say, well, maybe he saw somebody else who was crucified. Now you're just coming up with ad hoc sort of explanations to cover what appears to be an eyewitness account that comports with other eyewitness details throughout John's gospel.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

And there are 59 of those, and we list them in, "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist." Fifty-nine historically confirmed or historically probable eyewitness details, just in the Gospel of John. So, if we're going to try and discover what happened in the past, we've got to rely on testimony. We can't go back in time and repeat the event. We can't resurrect Jesus, kill Him, and then resurrect Him again or witness it. We can only go on what people saw at the time. Much more on this right after the break. You're listening to, "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist" with Frank Turek. Back in two minutes.

Welcome back to "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist" with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network, 180 or so stations around the country. This is also a podcast. And so, those of you listening on the American Family Radio Network, a great network, by the way, led by my friend Tim Wildman. If you're listening to this, and you say, wow, I want to hear that again, then you can check out the "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist" podcast and listen to it anytime you want. There's also a midweek version of this, which is not broadcast on the American Family Radio Network. It's a midweek "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist" podcast. So, if you want to listen to that, it comes out on Tuesday. This one airs, as you know, on Saturday, on the American Family Radio Network.

Today, we are talking about, can you give scientific evidence for an historical event like the resurrection? And so far, we've said, if you're talking about repeatable evidence, can you go in the laboratory and repeat it? No, because nothing from history is repeatable. You have to rely on eyewitness testimony or clues left behind that you can examine. For example, let's go back to last week. There are clues that we can get that say the universe had a beginning. Because when you look into space, you're really looking at the past. You're looking at history. And one way we know for example, that the universe had a beginning, is the expanding universe. We covered that last week. We can still see that the universe is expanding. And so, if you turn time back, you're going to see everything collapse back to a point, where space, time, and matter go to zero. That's the creation point.

Or you look at the radiation afterglow. That's the remnant heat from the Big Bang explosion. The heat is still out there. You can still detect it. So, these are clues leftover from the Big Bang, but you can't repeat the Big Bang, right? It's the Big Bang Theory. It's not the big bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang theory. You can't go in the laboratory and do it over and over again. So, it depends on what you mean by science. The questioner here, his name is Mike. For those of you just tuning in, he was asking for scientific evidence for the resurrection. When you look at the stars, yeah, it's partially scientific. But that's because you're looking into the past. You can witness what happened in the past. It's a clue leftover.

How do you witness what happened to George Washington? Or how do you witness what happened to Jesus? You have to rely on testimony and other clues left behind. So, you might say, it depends on what you mean by science. And I might ask Mike, can you give me scientific evidence that Jesus did not rise from the dead? Well, that's a pretty high bar. No, I'm just going

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

to assume that everybody that dies stays dead, because that's what we observe today. Well, now you're using the Principle of Uniformity.

You're assuming that if everyone you see here in your limited ability to observe people is quite limited, you have to take other people's word for it, that people are dying on the other side of the world, or people you can't observe, right? You're taking that on authority. You can't observe that yourself. But if you're going to say that everybody you know in your circle dies, and so therefore, everybody dies, and everybody died in the past, and nobody has resurrected from the dead because you have never witnessed it, well, you're making an assumption. Maybe it's a good assumption.

But you know what else you're doing? When you say that all dead people stay dead, you're actually demonstrating something that's necessary for a miracle to be detectable. Because if not all people stayed dead, generally speaking, how could you ever detect a miracle? How could you ever detect a resurrection? I mean, if people popped up from the dead routinely, what would the resurrection of Christ mean to us? It would mean nothing. I mean, suppose you go to somebody, and you go, Jesus rose from the dead to prove he was God. And by trusting in Him, you can have your sins forgiven. And the guy goes, so what? Uncle Leroy just rose from the dead two weeks ago. Now I have to give the inheritance back.

No, look, if people were popping up from the dead routinely, the miracle known as the resurrection would have no apologetic value. It wouldn't tell us anything. It would just say, hey, this is the normal state of affairs. This stuff normally happens. But since it doesn't happen most of the time, in fact, in all of my experience, it never happens. I've never seen a resurrection. Have you? No, I haven't seen one. That would seem to me to be at least necessary for a miracle to occur. The only way you can detect a special act of God, is to see over and over and over again, natural laws doing what they do routinely. That's the only way you can detect something that stands out.

People don't walk on water. People don't part Red Seas. People don't raise the dead, routinely. If they did, then those really wouldn't be miracles. We'd say this stuff happens all the time. So, this is one of the problems with David Hume's argument against miracles. He just assumes that since he has never seen anyone rise from the dead, then nobody can rise from the dead. But of course, ladies and gentlemen, the miracle known as the resurrection isn't even the greatest miracle in the Bible. The greatest miracle in the Bible is the first verse: In the beginning God, created the heavens and the Earth. If that verse is true, every other verse is at least possible. And we now actually have scientific evidence that the first verse of the Bible is indeed true.

What is it? We covered it last week, that space, matter, and time had a beginning out of nothing. And even atheists are admitting that space, time, and matter had a beginning out of nothing. So, if God is the creator of the universe, as the evidence seems to point. It's got to be a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent being, to choose to create out of nothing. If God exists, and Genesis 1:1 is true, then every other verse in the Bible is at least possible.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

Every other miracle in the Bible is at least possible. We're not saying it has to occur. I mean, the Bible could be wrong after that. We're just saying it's possible. But if Genesis 1:1 is true, Jesus rose from the dead. Because if God exists, then He can raise somebody from the dead.

First of all, He's sinless, and can forgive sinners. He does that right in the opening couple of chapters of Mark. Who else can forgive sin but God alone? Exactly. Jesus is saying, take up your palate and walk. Your sins are forgiven. What? Yeah, Jesus is claiming to be God by forgiving sins. So, He's sinless and can forgive sins. He also has power over sickness. He can heal people who are sick. He has power over nature. He can calm the storm. He can turn water into wine. Nature hurts us. And finally, He can raise the dead, and He himself is raised from the dead.

And by the way, when you look at the miracles of Jesus, they're not random events. They're not used for entertainment. He's not doing card tricks. He's not sawing women in half. He's not making the Statue of Liberty disappear. He's doing miracles in the four areas that cause us trouble here in this life. What are the four problems that we have? We sin. We get sick. Nature can hurt us. And ultimately, we die. And notice, the 35 or so miracles that are attributed to Jesus are in those four categories.

So, what is Jesus saying? He's saying, I'm the Messiah. I'm the Savior. I can actually fix what's wrong with this world. I can fix sin. I can fix sickness. I can fix nature. And I can fix death. I have power over death. So, when Jesus rises from the dead, that's the ultimate miracle. That's the ultimate miracle saying, I have power over this fallen world. And by trusting in me, you will be risen from the dead as well. That's the whole point. That's where we're heading. We're heading for a resurrection, where the world is going to be transformed. And our natures are going to be transformed. We're not going to have the sin nature anymore. We're going to get an imperishable body, where we're going to live forever on this remade heavens and Earth. And Jesus is the first fruits of that resurrection. So, if Genesis 1:1 is true, every other verse is at least possible.

Now, we have good scientific evidence that Genesis 1:1, at least, the fact that the universe had a beginning, is true. So, do you need a lot more scientific evidence to say, it's possible that a man rose from the dead because God wanted him to rise from the dead as the ultimate miracle? To say, this is the Savior? This is the Messiah? This is the one that can correct what's ultimately wrong with this world? So, can I give you explicit, repeatable in a laboratory scientific evidence for the resurrection of Jesus? No, nobody can. Again, it is a category mistake. You're asking for a repeatable event about a historical event. You're asking for repeatable evidence, about a historical event. That's very rare. Especially something like the resurrection, or any garden variety event from history.

George Washington being sworn in as the first president. Caesar crossing the Rubicon. Martin Luther attacking the 95 Theses on the church in Wittenberg, Germany. You can't give scientific evidence for that. You can give testimony. You can give what people said they saw. You can

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

give clues left behind, archaeological evidence for certain things. By the way, that's what we're doing on Monday night. Monday night, April 3, don't forget at 7:30pm Eastern time, tune into our YouTube channel. And if you can't get the YouTube channel, you can go to our website CrossExamined.org. You can watch us going through the major archaeological discoveries of the Bible, but we're still in Genesis. There's so much evidence in Genesis, believe it or not. We're on the fourth episode, so check that out there.

Also, I want to mention, this is the last chance for you to join me, in Life's Compass: Jesus, You and the Essentials of the Faith. The first Zoom session is April 4. So, if you want to sign up for that, go to CrossExamined.org. Click on online courses, you'll see it there. If you join the premium version, you'll be with me for six Zoom sessions for Q&A. We'll learn from one another. And you'll also get 17 hours of teaching on the essentials of the faith. We cover a lot of ground in that particular course. You don't want to miss it. So, sign up. We're not going to run it for quite a while after this. So, go to CrossExamined.org, click on Online Courses. You'll see it there. Much more after the break. Don't go anywhere. You're listening to "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist" with me, Frank Turek. Back in just two minutes.

Can you get all your truth from science? The answer, of course, is no. That truth itself doesn't come from science, ladies and gentlemen. In fact, you know certain philosophical truths better than you know scientific truths. For example, you know that your senses are reliable. Not that you can't make mistakes, you can make mistakes. You sometimes can see things that aren't there, or you can mishear things. But we know generally that your senses are reliable. If they're not reliable, you can't do science. Because science is built on you getting sense data from outside your mind. Also, you know that the law of non-contradiction and the other laws of logic. You know that with more certainty than you know scientific truths.

You say, how so? Because in order to know scientific truths, you have to assume those laws of logic. And if you can't assume those laws of logic, then the scientific truths that you think you know, are no more certain than the foundation upon which you've built those scientific observations. So, the ability to observe our philosophical presuppositions that have to be secure in order for you to get secure results from the scientific world, or from the natural world by doing say, scientific experiments or by doing historical investigations. Those conclusions can be no more certain than the foundational assumptions you make that help you arrive at those conclusions, is what I'm trying to say here.

In fact, you know, some moral truths better than, you know, scientific truths. And J. P. Moreland, we had on the program a couple of years ago, because he wrote a book called "Scientism and Secularism", a great book. And the subtitle is "Learning to Respond to a Dangerous Ideology." What's the dangerous ideolog? Scientism, that we get all our truth from science. And what Moreland says in the book is he says, "You know, certain moral truths better than, you know, scientific truths."

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

For example, according to Moreland, there's been four different theories of how electrons work in the past couple 100 years, whenever they discovered electrons, past 150 years, whatever it's been. Four different theories. And he says, I could see us maybe 50 years from now, or maybe even sooner, discovering something about electrons we didn't know and changing our theory of how electrons work, or what they do. Some new theory can arise because we have new observations. He said, but I can't see us 50 years from now saying, you know, torturing babies for fun is now a good thing. You know that torturing babies for fun is morally wrong, with more certainty than you know that the current theory of electrons is correct. That's Moreland's point, and I think he's right about that.

You can say, well, you know, there's some people out there that are crazy. Yeah, Okay. I'm not talking about crazy people. I'm not talking about how people do immoral things all the time. That would not be morality, but more sociology how people behave. I'm talking about the fact that it is wrong to torture babies for fun now, and it will be 1000 years from now, despite the fact that our view of electrons might change 1000 years from now. And we know that moral truth, that it's wrong to torture babies for fun, we know that better than, and with more certainty than we know what the current theory of electrons is? That it's absolutely correct. So, you can't do science without philosophy. It's built on philosophy.

In fact, a question I might ask Mike. And for those who are just tuning in, Mike sent in a question. The question was, can you give me scientific arguments for Jesus's resurrection? And the answer is no, because it's an historical event. And I might ask Mike, if he was here, what is science? How do you define science? Because Sir Francis Bacon, the founder of modern science, I'm loosely defining or paraphrasing what he said. Science is a search for causes. When you're doing science, you're trying to find what particular cause, caused a particular effect. And there are at least two types of causes. There's natural causes and intelligent causes. Or we might say, non-intelligent and intelligent. Non-intelligent, meaning natural, and intelligent meaning say, a person. A person does something, and he's intelligent.

And there's also two types of science. There's empirical science. That's something you can observe over and over again. And then there's forensic science or historical science, you can't observe it over and over again. You've got to look at clues, as we mentioned. You have to rely on testimony. So, one deals with something that's repeatable, over and over again. In fact, John Lennox has a great illustration to drive this point home. John Lennox, the wonderful apologist from Oxford University, the mathematician. By the way, pray for John. He had a stroke not long ago. He seems to be doing okay. We've emailed back and forth, but he's not traveling much anymore. I want to get back on the program.

In any event, Lennox has this question that he asks his students. He says, suppose you have a Model T Ford in front of you, an old Model T. And suppose I were to ask you, what explains the Model T? Henry Ford, or the laws of internal combustion? But you can only pick one. Only one of those two causes can you pick. And his students always come back to him and say, Dr. Lennox, you actually you need both. You need Henry Ford to create the car, design the car,

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

build the car, but then you need the laws of internal combustion to allow the Model T Ford to operate. I mean, if the laws of internal combustion changed every 10 minutes, the Model T would not operate. You need both. And Lennox says, exactly, students. Why can't people like Richard Dawkins, and Lawrence Krauss, and other atheists see this?

And to say that you've gotten really good at understanding the laws of internal combustion, that somehow because you understand the laws of internal combustion, so well, there's no longer a need for Henry Ford. That would not make sense. But that's essentially what many atheistic scientists say today. Because we're really good at understanding how the world operates, we have no need for a creator or a sustainer of the world. That doesn't follow. Just because you know how a car operates, doesn't mean someone didn't create or design the car. Obviously, someone did. So, you need both. You need a creator. And then you also need the laws of internal combustion to keep the car running.

And if I were to say to you, can you give me laws of internal combustion? Can you tell me what laws of internal combustion can explain Henry Ford? I would say, you're engaged in a category mistake. You're asking for a category of evidence that doesn't fit the object of inquiry. The object of inquiry is a human being, a designer. Not the laws of internal combustion. The laws of internal combustion may reflect the mind of the of the designer. But the laws of internal combustion can't explain why you have a designer. The designer may help explain why you have the laws of internal combustion, but not the other way around.

Now, obviously, Henry Ford didn't create the laws of internal combustion. But God, who created this universe, and created the laws that allow it to operate and sustains the laws that allow it to operate...the orderliness we find in the universe, are a reflection of God's mind. I think it may have been Kepler who said, we're thinking God's thoughts after him. When we observe the natural world, when we're doing science. We're thinking God's thoughts after him. So, we have to keep our categories correct. You're not going to get repeatable evidence for a one time historical event. You're not going to go in a laboratory and look and repeat a historical event. You're only going to look at testimony and clues. That's the right way of trying to discover whether Jesus rose from the dead.

And as we've talked about many times in this program, we have in our books, Mike...if you check out "I Don't have Enough Faith to be an Atheist", or "Stealing from God", or "Hollywood Heroes", you're going to get evidence that Jesus actually rose from the dead. Probably the best book for that would be, "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist." And one question I might ask you, Mike. We know that the early believers were all Jews. They're all believers in Yahweh. They already think they're God's chosen people. They didn't think that a man could claim to be God and rise from the dead. They knew that we'd all rise at the end, according to Daniel 12. But they didn't think one man would claim to be God and rise from the dead in the middle of time. First of all, claiming to be God was blasphemy. And they didn't think this guy would rise from the dead in the middle of time. They thought we'd all rise at the end of time.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Why would these Jews give up their long held religious beliefs for a lie? Why would they do that? Doesn't appear to me they would do that. Because you see, the New Testament, or let me put it another way...Christianity did not originate with a book. Christianity originated with an event, the resurrection. Do you realize there were 1000s of Christians before a line of the New Testament was ever written? Why? Because these early Jewish people witnessed a man claimed to be God and rise from the dead. They never would have said that. They never would have invented it. They didn't believe it. And they never would have said it if it didn't happen. They wouldn't certainly have endured excommunication from the synagogue and then be beaten, tortured, and killed for a lie. They wouldn't have done that. So, they're not making it up.

The best evidence we have for the resurrection are the documents that claim this. And there's other evidence that we don't have time to get into in this program. But get the book, "I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist", and you can see it there. Friends, don't forget about the online course. This is the last week to sign up. Go to CrossExamined.org. Click on Online Courses. You'll see it there. It's "Life's Compass: Jesus, You, and the Essentials of the Faith." Also, I'll be in Ohio State on April 6. Hope to see you there. Or you can watch it LIVE, here on the livestream. God bless. See you here next week.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

