

## Is Christianity a White Man's Religion? Plus More Q&A

(July 4, 2023)

### Frank:

Ladies and gentlemen, is Christianity a white man's religion? How can people be saved in the tribulation period if God sends them a strong delusion as 2 Thessalonians says? Is it ever right to torture someone to save lives? Can you trust God, that He will physically protect your family? We also have a question about transgender ideology. These are all questions you've sent in that I hope to get to on today's podcast. Welcome if you're listening on July 4th, Happy Independence Day.

It is year 247 of this great experiment known as the United States of America. And as Benjamin Franklin was asked when the Constitution...I think it was the Constitution, or was it the Declaration of Independence? I can't quite remember. But he was asked, I think it was at the Constitutional Convention. He was asked the question after they came up with the Constitution, what kind of government did you give us, Mr. Franklin? And he said, a republic, if you can keep it. We're going to have to work hard to keep this republic ladies and gentlemen, because people want to tear it down.

And we need to speak the truth in love so people can flourish. Listen to the last podcast we did on this past Friday or Saturday for more on that. But what I want to do now is get to these questions that you've emailed in. If you want to email us a question, you can email us at [Hello@CrossExamined.org](mailto:Hello@CrossExamined.org). I am sorry, I can't get to all of them. But I'll try and get to these today. Let's start with the first one.

Brian from Kenya writes in. He says, I appreciate your work done in investigating the truth about Christianity. However, he's got this issue. And this one issue says this, there have been a number of Africans and maybe even African Americans who would reject Christianity due to it being promoted by the whites who participated in the slave trade and the colonizers, with the need to embrace African roots.

So, he's basically saying that the Africans want to embrace African roots, not so-called white roots. And he says it's because of that, that many would automatically reject the Gospel. And he says, the example from Nigeria where the killing of many Christians is because...

This is not a complete sentence. I don't think English is his native language. But he says, from Nigeria, killing many Christians due to not wanting to be involved with anything to do with the whites. Okay. This was kind of an issue when I went to South Africa in 2015. People were trying to say, you know, how do you address the question of Christianity as a white man religion? Well, let's first of all start out by saying Jesus wasn't white. Okay? So, there you go.



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

He was Semitic; he was Jewish. So, he wasn't white, technically. Secondly, it's the genetic...I mean, if you want the logical answer...I don't know if everyone's going to buy the logic, or everyone's going to be swayed by the reasons. But I'll just give you the philosophically, the logical answer. The first is, Jesus wasn't white; he was Semitic. Secondly, to discount something because of its source is known as the genetic fallacy. The source doesn't make it wrong or untrue. You can have a good source give you bad information. You can have a bad source giving you good information.

You have to evaluate the information, or the claim, or the religion based on the evidence itself, regardless of its source. So, even if Jesus was white, and all the disciples were white, that wouldn't mean it was wrong. Or if they were all black, it wouldn't mean it was right. That's not the issue. The issue is, does God exist and did Jesus rise from the dead? If those two things are true, then Christianity is true. Okay? So, evaluate the evidence for the claim, not just the source.

You know, Hitler believed smoking was wrong. He was right about that. He's normally a bad source, but not on this topic. He had it right. Richard Dawkins is right that there's only two genders. He says, I'm sorry, it's science. Just because he's an atheist doesn't mean he's wrong on all things, Christians. In fact, unfortunately for Christians, Richard Dawkins has been right more times lately than many American pastors on these issues. Richard Dawkins is open to speaking on these issues of transgenderism, and Islamophobia, and censorship.

Richard Dawkins has said, censorship and canceled culture is wrong. How often do you hear pastors talking about that? He said, there's no such thing as Islamophobia because Islam is not a race. It's an ideology. And maybe you ought to be afraid of jihad ideology. And he's also said, I'm sorry, there's only two genders. It's science.

Meanwhile, most pastors are hiding under their desks over these issues, and Richard Dawkins is speaking the truth. So, just because he doesn't believe in your worldview doesn't mean he's wrong. And by the way, when the Christians who participated in the slave trade, advocated slavery, that was the illogical outworking of Christianity, not the logical outworking of Christianity. They were doing what was wrong. They were violating the Scriptures, not adhering to the Scriptures. In fact, Jesus says one reason He came, was to set the captives free, free from sin and free from slavery.

And as we've said many times on this program, John Dickson, the historian who now is at, I think, at Wheaton College, asked you to consider this little analogy when people say I can't believe in Christianity because Christians have been jerks. The question to ask people is, when somebody plays Beethoven poorly, who do you blame? Yeah, you don't blame Beethoven. You blame the player.

So, when somebody plays Jesus poorly, you don't blame Jesus. When somebody doesn't represent Christianity properly, you don't blame Christianity. You don't judge a religion by its

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

abuse. You judge a religion by whether or not its precepts are true, whether or not it's telling the truth about reality. If it is, even if people get it wrong, it's still true.

So, I might say to people, the folks also that got rid of slavery were the true Christians, people like Wilberforce. Wilberforce started the abolition movement, first in England, and then of course, it spread over here. So, although there were some so-called Christians trying to advance slavery, illegitimately, the ones that got rid of slavery were the Christians. In fact, to show you how some so-called Christians tried to advance slavery...

So, slavery as we know it, here in America, if you follow the Bible, you would punish the slave traders by death. Maybe the most important point in this entire question that we need to make, is that the Bible from start to finish, shows that God seeks to save the entire world from every ethnic group. In fact, people from all nations will be blessed by the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Jesus. Just start in Genesis.

They made the slavery bible, where they cut out so much of the Bible that talked about liberation, that it was basically special pleading. They were using passages in the Old Testament that weren't talking about chattel slavery, but indentured servitude in the Old Testament. They used these Old Testament passages to try and advocate for chattel slavery, which the Bible doesn't advocate for. In fact, the Bible, both in the Old and New Testament says that kidnapping people is punishable by death. Well, certainly the Old Testament says that.

Genesis 22:18, it's where God is actually speaking to Abraham. He says, through your offspring, all nations on earth will be blessed, because you have obeyed me. In other words, God is coming to save the entire world, the world that's open to him, the world that wants to be saved. But even God can't force people into heaven against his will. So, he gives us free will.

But he wants all nations to be saved. As you know, Jonah goes to the Gentiles. He goes to Nineveh, if there is a "for God so loved the world" section of the Old Testament, it's probably Jonah. He's going to save the evil people in Nineveh. Jonah is actually upset when the people in Nineveh repent, to show you what kind of a prophet he was. The guy goes there to try and convert them. And then when they're converted, he's disappointed. God, I wanted you to judge him. Are we that way, too?

How about Daniel 7? In Daniel 7, this is talking about the Son of Man. Daniel says in verses 13-14, he says, in my vision at night I looked and before me, was one like a Son of Man. Now, notice the Son of Man was Jesus's favorite title for himself. But who is the Son of Man in Daniel? He's going to explain. Here's what Daniel says. This Son of Man is coming with the clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days (a reference to God the Father) and was led into his presence. And to him was given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which will not pass away and his kingdom, one that shall not be destroyed. So, all peoples, nations, and languages...

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Christianity is not an ethnically unitary religion. It's not a racist religion. There are some people who have claimed to be Christians who have been racist. Again, they are not being consistent. That's the illogical outworking of Christianity, not the logical outworking of Christianity. In fact, you know what the logical outworking of Darwinism is? Racism. Darwin's famous *Origin of Species*, the subtitle talks about the "favored races." Because you see, we're all fighting on this hierarchy. We're trying to get to the top. There's a survival of the fittest. And Darwin was a racist. And Darwinism implies racism, not Christianity.

Christianity goes in the other direction and says this is for all peoples. The Great Commission that Jesus gives us, he says, go make disciples of all nations. And then Paul in Galatians 3, he also says this in Colossians 3. He says, so in Christ Jesus, you are all children of God through faith. For all of you who were baptized into Christ, have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile. Stop.

This was revolutionary for the Jew at that point. Because despite the fact that the Old Testament said God was reaching out to the whole world, there were many Jews at the time, who were very sectarian. There were many Jews who wouldn't even associate with Gentiles. That's why Paul had to go and slap Peter, as recorded in Galatians chapter two. Because he had decided that he was not going to interact with the Gentiles anymore. And that was racism. Paul is basically calling him out in Galatians chapter two, the chapter before from which I'm reading.

Peter was going back to the old ways of separating himself from the Gentiles, because the Jews, in his mind, were superior prior to Christ coming. Anyway, Paul says this. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus. Now, if there is ever a cure for a society at odds with one another over identity, this verse is the cure. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free. There is neither male nor female, you are all one in Christ Jesus.

Christianity includes everybody. It makes the offer to everybody. Now, some people don't accept the offer, but everybody's invited to the wedding. Some people deny the invitation. And as you know, the Bible starts with a wedding, and it ends with a wedding, and you're invited. If you go to Revelation 7:9, it says this. After this, I looked, and behold a great multitude that no one could number from every nation, from all tribes, and peoples, and languages, standing before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes with palm branches in their hands.

Notice the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, talks about the fact that Christianity is for all people, all tribes, all languages, all people, all ethnic groups, all races. There's only one race, the human race. But all ethnic groups are welcome. And there will be all ethnic groups actually represented in heaven. And don't forget, Paul himself was commissioned to be an apostle to the Gentiles. Jesus actually tells Ananias, as Luke tells the conversion of Paul in Acts 9...

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Here's what Acts 9:15-16 says. Go, for Saul is an instrument whom I have chosen to bring my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and before the people of Israel. I, myself, (Jesus is speaking), will show Paul how much he must suffer for the sake of my name. And then you notice, most of the rest of the book of Acts in chapters 13-28 records Paul's fulfillment of this commission, as he preaches through Asia Minor, Greece, and finally, all the way to Rome, which is the center of the Gentile world.

So, to say that Christianity is a white man's religion, that person doesn't know anything about what the Scriptures actually say. And it falls into the trouble I mentioned earlier. Jesus himself wasn't white. It's the genetic fallacy. Anybody who is racist is engaged in the illogical outworking of Christianity, not the logical outworking of Christianity. Christianity is a religion that goes to all nations, all people, all ethnic groups. All right?

So, good question Brian, and prayers for you out there in Kenya. In fact, I may have mentioned this once on the podcast. We're about to start a new initiative, to translate our most effective videos and articles into the top seven languages on the continent of Africa. Because in Africa, there's 1.4 billion people. That's more than four times the population of the United States. So, we're going to take the seven top languages, and translate our best stuff, and send it over to Africa.

We've got a team in Africa already that will represent us there, and they will be our people on the ground in Africa, and people on the internet to get this information out to people who live on that continent. So, our best material will be available to the 1.4 billion people that live in Africa. By the way, if you want to be a part of this, you can donate to us at [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). It's going to take a lot of money and a lot of effort to do, but we're going to do it.

We think it's worth the investment to reach 1.4 billion people, at least give them access to our best material. And as I say, the people in Africa are going to let us know what's going to resonate the best. What are the issues in Africa that need attention the most? You know, in Africa, they believe in the supernatural. You know, you don't have to try and convince them the supernatural exists. They see it. But they are in a life and death struggle with Islam in many places, including Nigeria, where another group of Christians were just killed recently by Muslims over there. And so, we want to get our best material over there. So, if you want to be a part of that, go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on Donate and make a donation there. It is tax deductible. Thank you for helping us.

Okay, first of all, let's read the passage directly. In 2 Thessalonians 2, Paul is talking about what appears to be the coming of the Antichrist, and he says this. The coming of the lawless one will be in accordance with the work of Satan, displayed in all kinds of counterfeit miracles, signs, and wonders, and in every sort of evil that deceives those who are perishing.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Alright, let's go to Ken in Texas who writes, 2 Thessalonians 2:10-11 says God will send a strong delusion upon unbelievers. Those who refuse to love the truth and be saved. This strong delusion is so that they may believe what is false. If this is the case, how can the tribulation produce millions of new believers? Love your work, Frank. I've already used a lot of what you've taught.

Why did they perish? It says they perish because they refused to love the truth and to be saved. Notice this, they refuse to love the truth. Not just that they didn't believe the truth. They refused it; they rejected it. And Paul says, for this reason. What reason? Because they refuse to love the truth and be saved. Paul says, God sends them a powerful delusion so that they will believe the lie, and so that all will be condemned who have not believed the truth but have delighted in wickedness.

Okay, so this is judgment, now. They had their chance. They had the truth. They rejected it. Now God's going to judge them. Now, I have Logos Bible software, which is amazing software. You ought to consider getting it. By the way, Jorge, if there's some sort of discount code, just send it to me, or you can come on a little bit later and tell what the discount code is for people that want the software. It's really great stuff. Look it up, and then let me know, and then you can come on and tell us what that is.

Anyway, I'm reading a passage from one of the commentaries on 2 Thessalonians 2, what we're talking about here. This happens to be the Bible Knowledge commentary, the first commentary I ever got when I first became a Christian, back in the early 90's, or late 80's. This commentary was written by the faculty at Dallas Theological Seminary. So, these people are pre-millennial folks that believe in the rapture and all that. I don't take a strong position on eschatology, because it's not a fundamental of the faith. And I know many intelligent scholars who are conservative, that are way smarter than me, and they come to opposite conclusions on eschatology.

But let's just assume for the sake of argument, that the pre-millennial rapture view is correct. This is the view that the Bible Knowledge commentary takes. Here's what they say about this passage. Is this passage saying that those who do not believe the Gospel before the man of sin is revealed (the Antichrist), and who are therefore not caught up to meet the Lord at the rapture, but still live on the earth cannot be saved after the man of lawlessness has been revealed? Or can people who recognize, but knowingly reject the truth of the Gospel before the rapture, be saved after the rapture takes place?

This commentator writes, the powerful delusion that God will bring on these individuals in particular, suggests that few if any then living on the earth will be saved after the rapture. This seems to be a special judgment from God, that will occur at this one time in history. The many saints, which the book of Revelation indicates who will be living on the earth during the tribulation (remember, that's the seven year period), may thus be people who did not hear and reject the Gospel before the rapture. And he says, look at Revelation 7:4.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

Okay, so he seems to be saying not many will be saved. But you could also say this. Are all unbelievers refusing to love the truth right now? This is me talking, not this commentator. I mean, there are people out right now, who are unbelievers, but they're not refusing to love the truth right now. They may not just have it, or they're in the process of getting it. You know, some are seeking the truth by responding to the Holy Spirit. If not, no one would ever be saved.

Okay, so it may be that there are people who aren't Christians, obviously, when the rapture occurs. But they're still seeking God. And they could come to faith during the tribulation. The other people who have already rejected the truth, are going to be judged according to the passage. But that doesn't rule out another category of people who haven't completely rejected the truth. They're in the process of getting there, but they haven't gotten there yet.

And this is why, ladies and gentlemen, we all need to remember that everyone is at a different place in their spiritual life. Some are moving closer to Jesus; others are moving further away. This is why I think we need patience with unbelievers. Just as God was patient with you and me when we were not a believer. I mean, people will say to me, Frank, you seem to be so patient with people when they ask you questions on college campuses. Why is that?

And I'm saying, why would I expect some 21 year old kid to agree with me when I'm 61? Why would I expect that? I didn't believe what I believe now at 21. So, why should I believe some 21 year old kid now agree with me at 61? I don't know how much life experience this kid has, or what he believes, or why he believes it, or what kind of upbringing he's had, or what kind of opportunity...

I don't know. He may be in the process. Everyone's in a process. Why should you expect everyone to be at exactly the same place you are in your spiritual interest and development right now? Why weren't you five years ago, where you are today? Or 10 years ago, or 20, or 30, depending how old you are. Right? We're all in process of either getting closer to or further from Jesus, sometimes day to day. Right?

You shouldn't expect everybody to agree with you. You shouldn't expect everybody to be at the same level of spiritual interest and commitment as everyone else. Because you weren't at the same level of spiritual maturity and interest as you are right now, maybe five or 10 years ago. Okay?

All right. So, Daniel writes in and says, in the podcast discussing the topic, transgender, Frank brought up the point about transgender people having the presupposition of male and female to even know about the other gender. I'm having a hard time processing, how the knowledge of both genders is a flaw in the thinking of this transgender ideology. I fully support you, Frank. Thank you for all the amazing work you do. Okay. Thanks, Daniel.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Well, I do have an article that we just published on our website CrossExamined.org, called "5 Fatal Flaws of Transgender Ideology", which unpacks it more, Daniel. You may want to check that out. Also, it's in the book "Correct, Not Politically Correct: About Same-Sex Marriage and Transgenderism." That blogpost was adapted from the book. But let me just say a couple of things about it. It's a flaw, because these people who are supporting transgender ideology want to have it both ways.

On one hand, they want to say that there are no fixed genders, that gender is completely fluid, that gender and sex are two completely different things. But on the other hand, they unwittingly must presume there are fixed genders. Otherwise, transgenderism would be impossible. Why? Because look, if I'm a man and I think I'm a woman, I have to have some idea what a man is, and some idea what a woman is to know I have this mismatch between my psychology and my biology.

If there were no fixed genders, this mismatch couldn't exist. Also, if I want to make the transition from man to woman, which is biologically impossible, but people still try it, I have to have some idea what a what a man is and some idea what a woman is to try and make the so-called transition. If there were no fixed genders, that would be impossible. If there were no fixed points, you couldn't do that. And by the way, transgenderism must therefore presuppose that genders are fixed at one point, and at the same time, also say they're fluid. You can't have it both ways. It's one or the other.

If you're saying, well, I can go between the two. Not biologically you can't. Of course, you can think whatever you want. But biologically, you can either reproduce a sperm or an egg. There's no third category. And anybody that can't produce either of those, that's an incapacity, not a third capacity to do something else. So, hopefully that helps explain it because, Daniel, they're trying to have it both ways.

They're trying to on one hand say there are no fixed genders. On the other hand, they're trying to say genders are completely fluid. But in order for transgenderism to be possible, you would need fixed genders. Because what am I transitioning from into if there are no fixed genders? Why am I trying to take hormones and get surgery if sex and gender have nothing in common? If they're completely different things? Why are you trying to mess with my biology if my biology has nothing to do with my gender? You can't have it both ways. It's contradictory.

All right, shalom, Dr. Turek, writes Luke. He says, he was watching Batman movies. Suddenly, he says, this made me think about torture in war movies, where someone has nuclear launch codes or information. If it's made known to the people torturing, they then could save a lot of people. Everyone agrees torturing for fun is wrong. But is this type of torture for truth morally acceptable? Is it acceptable if the government were to conduct it with the end to protect its citizens?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Now, this is actually a very tough ethical situation here. And I could be wrong about this because it is so tough. Is it the ends justify the means if you say yes? In other words, if you say that, yeah, it's right to torture somebody because you're going to save a lot more people if you torture this one guy, because he has information that can get you to defuse the ticking time bomb. Which, if you don't get the information from him, a lot of people are going to die.

You remember that old TV show, 24? I mean, the whole show is about this, right? Jack Bauer, played by Kiefer Sutherland, would just go torture one person after another and make them real uncomfortable. There was always a ticking time bomb and nuke about to go off, something like that. So, it was a real suspenseful show.

And so, what is this? Would it be an illicit end in means situation if you say yes? Or is this a case of what we would call graded absolutism, when you're caught in a dilemma? We've talked about this before. Because in the fallen world, you sometimes will be caught in a dilemma. You ought not torture people. But then you ought not knowingly allow a whole bunch of people to be murdered either. So, what do you do? I mean, it's the old "Nazis at the door" kind of situation, where you're hiding Jews in your attic. And you get the knock at the door. Do you have Jews here?

Well, you're not supposed to lie, right? Yeah, you're supposed to say yeah, they're up in the attic. Actually, if you find three, keep looking because there's actually four. The fourth one kind of hides pretty well. Are you going to lie, or are you going to tell them the truth? Well, graded absolutism, which is a term my co-author Dr. Norman Geisler coined way back in the 70's, when he wrote the first book (maybe the 80's), called Christian Ethics. It's been updated. You ought to get the book, Christian Ethics. It says when you're put in a dilemma...

Some say, well, you should just tell the truth and trust God. Others say, no. Graded absolutism says you have a higher obligation to protect innocent life, than you do to tell the truth to a guilty murderer. So, in that case, you would lie. And there's biblical precedent for this. Like for example, the Hebrew midwives lied to Pharaoh's officials. When Pharaoh wanted to kill the Hebrew babies, the Hebrew midwives said, oh, these Hebrews, they give birth too quick. You know, we couldn't even catch them giving birth. So, we don't know where the boys are. They were lying.

Rahab lied about the spies and was rewarded for it. Is there a precedent to lie for a greater good, in other words? Now, notice in this situation, your intention isn't to lie. Your intention is to protect innocent life. So, you have a greater obligation to protect innocent life than you do to tell the truth to a guilty murderer. Same thing is true in a life raft dilemma, right? You've got a life raft that maybe holds only two people, but you've got five people trying to get on it. If all five get on, everybody dies. What do you do? Well, you have to kick three of them off, right? The intention is not to kill the three. The intention is to save the two.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Now, sometimes this dilemma is used, where professors will try and say, okay, here's the life raft dilemma. You guys break up into groups and report back. Tell me what the right thing to do is. And you know, people come with different answers. And so, the professor goes, see? Morality is relative; there is no right answer. Well, ladies and gentlemen, that's not the right outcome of this. Morality isn't relative because people come up with a different answer. In fact, it shows morality is objective, because you're struggling trying to come up with an answer, because you know how valuable life is.

If morality was relative, you know, if it was subjective, if it didn't really matter, if there was no right and wrong, you'd say, who cares? Throw everybody off the raft. It doesn't matter. There's no objective meaning, or no objective moral value to life. It doesn't matter how many people survive. Just kill them all. No, you don't say that. The reason you struggle with the problem is precisely because you know how valuable life is. And just because you don't know the right answer, doesn't mean there isn't a right answer.

And just because there are difficult answers that you might not quite know the answer to in morality, doesn't mean there aren't easy answers in morality. Right? Just because you might not be able to figure out the life raft dilemma, or the torture dilemma, doesn't mean that murder isn't wrong. Murder is still wrong. In fact, the reason that you're struggling with the life raft dilemma, or the torture dilemma is because you know murder is wrong. That's why you're struggling with it.

So, easy problems in morality aren't negated by difficult problems in morality. Just like easy problems in arithmetic are not negated by difficult problems in calculus. All right? So, what do we do here in the torture...? I could be wrong about this, but I think that if you were to make someone uncomfortable because he knows where the ticking time bomb is, it is your obligation to do so to save lives. And when I say uncomfortable, you can make somebody really uncomfortable without physically harming them permanently. In fact, we used to do it in the Navy all the time.

When I went through S.E.R.E. training...And I can't tell you much about this because it was classified. But I can tell you S.E.R.E. training was survival, evasion, resistance, and escape training in the Navy. And it's done in the Air Force and other situations where people may find themselves behind enemy lines or in a prisoner of war camp. They taught you basically what you could and couldn't do in a prisoner of war camp. Well, there was a big controversy back in the George W. Bush days of the Iraq War.

Apparently, we were waterboarding people who we had captured. We knew they were terrorists, and they had information that could save lives. And we were waterboarding them at Gitmo. And the media got wind of this, and maybe another Abu Ghraib, I think it was a prison in Iraq. Now what is waterboarding? We used to do it to our own personnel. It's where you invert somebody on a slanted bed. So, their head is lower than their feet. And you blindfold them, you gag them, and you pour water in their nose. And they think they're drowning. And they are if you keep

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

pouring water in their nose. But if you do that to somebody after a couple of minutes, they're going to go, uncle, what do you want to know? All right?

We did that to one of the...I can't remember the guy's name. But he revealed some very sensitive intelligence that wound up saving a lot of lives. Now, there was no permanent damage to this guy, no permanent physical damage. But we made him so uncomfortable, that he gave up the goods. Now, personally, I think that is something that is ethical to do. You're not making him uncomfortable. That's not your intention just for the sake of making him uncomfortable. You're doing that in order to save lives.

Now, people have a different view on this. I get it. It's not as clear cut. But if we can do it to our own US military personnel, can we do it to a terrorist who's about to detonate a nuke under New York? Yeah, I think we can. All right? By the way, get the book *Christian Ethics* by Norman Geisler. There's a lot of great stuff in there.

All right. Another question comes from Christian. Christian has been a student at CIA. Nice young man working in apologetics. He asks a couple of questions. One is, he's worried about evil in the world and God's eternal wisdom. He says, should I feel safe with or trust God, that He will keep me or my family safe from tragedy because he may want to use tragedy in our lives to bring something better? For example, sometimes we entrust God with our health, because He will protect us. But he may want to allow a terminal disease or injury to bring something good.

Or should I entrust God completely, that my future kids won't be born ill, or God forbid, be handicapped or killed? Okay. I'm just going to be straight with you, Christian. There's no guarantee that tragedy isn't going to befall you. There's no guarantee your kids are going to be born perfect, in terms of no ailments, no defects. There's no guarantee they won't be kidnapped or killed. There's no guarantee in life for this. We pray to God that He will protect us, and we ought to do that. But there's no guarantee. As you know, Jesus said, if they persecuted me, they're going to persecute you. Paul said, anyone who lives a faithful life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted.

You know, a lot of people leave the faith because evil happens. I don't know why they think that God has somehow promised them that evil won't happen to them. Because the exact opposite is true when you read the Scriptures. And when you look at some of the heroes of the faith, whether it's Isaiah, whether it's Paul, whether it's Jesus Himself, they all experienced...

In fact, all three of those experienced martyrdom as far as we know. I think Isaiah did, certainly Paul did, certainly Jesus did. And don't tell me they didn't have enough faith. I mean, Jesus was the only perfect human being who didn't deserve any evil, but he got it. So, if Jesus gets evil and suffering, might we get it, too? Yes, in this world, you will have trouble. But take heart, I have overcome the world. So, we certainly pray that we don't go through this difficulty. But when we do go through this difficulty, God has a reason for it. We know that all those who are called

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

according to His purpose, this is Romans chapter eight. We know that all things work together for good to those who love God and are called according to His purpose.

And it goes on to say, so they can be conformed to the image of His son. You know, Jesus learned obedience through suffering? The perfect God/man. The man that didn't have a sin nature, He learned obedience through suffering. If Jesus learned obedience through suffering, do you think we can learn obedience through suffering? Yeah, exactly. Now, we cover a lot of this in the book, *Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case*.

We have a whole chapter on evil, where we talk about the ripple effect at length. And briefly, as you know, the ripple effect is that every event that occurs in life ripples forward to effect trillions of other events. And so, when we see a tragedy we can't explain, we might not know the reason the tragedy occurred. But we know the reason we don't know why the tragedy occurred. We're inside of time; God's outside of time. He can see how that tragedy can ripple forward and affect all sorts of different things in the future, for good or ill. We can't track it all, but God can. We just have to trust God.

The second question Christian asks, I remember at last year's CIA, the CrossExamined Instructor Academy, you talked about the man who flew across the Atlantic Ocean, and later his kid was kidnapped. That of course, was Charles Lindbergh. His kid was kidnapped. He says, but then many people who weren't guilty confessed to being the ones who did it. I mentioned that about 200 people confessed to kidnapping Lindbergh's son because Lindbergh at the time was probably the most popular human being on Earth. And his child was kidnapped in New Jersey, and 200 people or so came forth and claimed they were the kidnapper when they really weren't.

And so, Christian goes on to say, you mentioned that some people want attention, even if it's by doing something that will get them killed. Clay Jones, in his book *Immortal*, talked about that as well. Some people want to make a name for themselves and go down in history as someone, even if it's ridiculous. What do you think? So, he's saying, doesn't that basically negate the claim that the apostles, that they suffered and died for a lie? Why would they suffer and die for a lie? We say they wouldn't. When in fact, there are some people that would. Well true, there are some people that would. Two hundred people came forth in the Lindbergh case.

But you've got to remember Christian, there are some crazy people out there that will do anything for attention. But that's out of millions. Millions of people knew about the Lindbergh kidnapping, and they were going to get the electric chair if they were convicted. And 200 crazy people came forth because they just wanted the notoriety. Maybe they just wanted the notoriety, and they could later say, no, I didn't do it. And there's no evidence they did. So, they would get the notoriety, and they wouldn't suffer the consequences of it.

Or there may have been some that said, yeah, I'll go to the electric chair if I can make a name for myself. But that's out of millions of people. Why would you have all of the apostles suddenly

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

doing this if Jesus hadn't risen from the dead? One hundred percent of them were willing to die for their belief, and to abandon their ancient religious viewpoint, that they thought they could go to Hell for if they didn't adhere to the Sabbath or, or the law of Moses, or circumcision. Now, they're suddenly giving all that up? Yeah, you might explain why out of 150 million people or 130 million people that were in America at the time, you had 200 of them saying, yeah, I did it, when I really didn't.

But you're not going to be able to explain how all of the apostles, 100% of them, or even 90% of them, said, yeah, I'm going to go to my death because of this. That doesn't make any sense. So, I really think that when you look at the evidence from not only what the apostles said and did, but what they gave up by saying and doing it, it's really strange credulity to say that they invented this. That they stole the body in order to get themselves beaten, tortured, and killed. And we talk about this a lot. And we talk about the New Testament.

Of course, it's in the book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. But you ought to go over to The Babylon Bee, and look at the video they did back in March, about "What if the Jesus resurrection was a hoax?" Something like that. It's a hilarious video, where they come up with the idea that, oh, we're going to steal the body. And then what happens? Well, we're going to get ourselves beaten, tortured, and killed. Can you go over that again? Why would we do that? You know?

Anyway, it's a real funny video, and it drives the point home. So, check that out there Christian, if you would, The Babylon Bee video. And we'll get to more of your questions next time if we can. Just email us a question at [Hello@CrossExamined.org](mailto:Hello@CrossExamined.org).

I had another question that I didn't have time to completely research yet. It's from Leah. Leah, you sent in a question about your daughter and a marriage partner. I haven't had a chance to completely research that, but I will. And I hope to get back to you soon. The rest of you, you can send a question to [Hello@CrossExamined.org](mailto:Hello@CrossExamined.org). And thank God, ladies and gentlemen, if you're listening to this in America, that you have independence, and it's Independence Day today.

For those of our listeners in Britain and Canada, we have significant listeners over there. We're all allies, ladies and gentlemen. So, let's continue to try and keep freedom. I know our folks, our friends up there in Canada have had some trouble with their government lately. Do what you can to stand for truth. We'll pray for you out there, as we will in Britain. Alright folks, thanks so much for being with us. We'll see you here next week. God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**

