

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

My Truth vs. THE Truth at Harvard

(December 15, 2023)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, what is the difference between my truth and the truth? Or between your truth and the truth? In fact, is there such a thing as my truth or your truth? Well, if you listen to the president of Harvard University, that's all there is, my truth and your truth, no THE truth. And unless you haven't been on media at all, you've heard about the testimony that three Ivy League college presidents gave to Congress a week or two ago from Harvard University, from the University of Pennsylvania, and from MIT (The Massachusetts Institute of Technology). And why was this testimony given?

Well, it's been given because there's been a lot of antisemitic, anti-Jewish rhetoric and actions going on, on college campuses. I'm going to read headlines. And this is from a story that we'll put in the show notes. This is a story that basically summarized what went on for the first three weeks after the October 7, Hamas attack on Israel. This article is actually published October 30. So, those attacks occurred three weeks before that. Here are a bunch of headlines, most of them from college campuses, about what happened between Hamas and Israel.

"Harvard student groups say Israel was entirely responsible for the attack." Let me remind you, ladies and gentlemen. This is when terrorists came across the border and murdered, tortured, and raped civilians, whether they were women, children, elderly, didn't matter. It took many of them hostages, and many of them are still hostages. According to some Harvard students, Israel was entirely responsible for that. "NYU students tear down posters of Israeli hostages." That's another headline right after the event. "U.C. Davis Professor threatens Zionist journalists and their families."

In fact, let me read you this threat from Assistant Professor of American Studies, an undergraduate faculty advisor. This is actually a woman by the name of Gemma de Cristo. She said this in a tweet "One group of people we have easy access to in the U.S. is all these Zionist journalists who spread propaganda and misinformation. They have houses with addresses, kids in school. They can fear their bosses, but they should fear us more." And then she has a knife, axe, and blood emojis after this. This is a U.C. Davis professor. Another headline, "Stanford University instructor separates Jewish students as colonizers." Because you can't be a colonizer. That's evil, right? Another headline, "Students of pro Hamas MIT students chant, one solution Intifada", which basically means, let's murder the Jews.

Another headline, "Students for Justice in Palestine call October 7th attack 'a historic win.'" And the list goes on. "Jewish students forced to barricade inside Cooper Union Library. Another, "Pro Palestinian George Washington University students project glory to our martyrs on school library." I actually went to George Washington University. I was an instructor there back in the late 80's, early 90's as an ROTC instructor and got a master's degree there. A very big Jewish

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

student population at George Washington University. And yet, you have these pro-Palestinian students projecting on the side of the library, "glory to our martyrs." Pro-Palestinian protesters assault Jewish student at Tulane University City. "Cornell University Jewish community threatened in online post. Police, FBI investigate." And the list goes on, ladies and gentlemen. So, Congress thought they had to do something to figure out what's going on on college campuses. So, they invited the three presidents of Harvard, MIT, and Penn to testify. And I'm just going to play three minutes of the testimony. Here is representative Elise Stefanik questioning these three presidents. Here she is.

ELISE STEFANIK:

At MIT, does calling for the genocide of Jews violate MIT's code of conduct or rules regarding bullying and harassment? Yes, or no?

SALLY KORNBLUTH:

If targeted at individuals, not making public statements?

ELISE:

Yes, or no? Calling for the genocide of Jews does not constitute bullying and harassment?

SALLY:

I have not heard calling for the genocide of Jews on our campus.

ELISE:

But you've heard chants for Intifada?

SALLY:

I've heard chants which can be antisemitic depending on the context, when calling for the elimination of the Jewish people.

ELISE:

So, those would not be according to MIT's code of conduct or rules?

SALLY:

That would be investigated as harassment if pervasive and severe.

ELISE:

Ms. MaGill, at Penn, does calling for the genocide of Jews violate Penn's rules or code of conduct? Yes, or no?

LIZ MAGILL:

If the speech turns into conduct, it can be harassment. Yes.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

ELISE:

I am asking, specifically calling for the genocide of Jews, does that constitute bullying or harassment?

LIZ:

If it is directed and severe or pervasive, it is harassment.

ELISE:

So, the answer is yes?

LIZ:

It is a context dependent decision, Congresswoman.

ELISE:

It's a context dependent decision. That's your testimony today? Calling for the genocide of Jews is depending upon the context, that is not bullying or harassment? This is the easiest question to answer yes, Ms. MaGill. So, is your testimony that you will not answer yes?

LIZ:

If the speech becomes conduct, it can be harassment, yes.

ELISE:

Conduct meaning committing the act of genocide? The speech is not harassment? This is unacceptable Ms. MaGill. I'm going to give you one more opportunity for the world to see your answer. Does calling for the genocide of Jews violate Penn's code of conduct when it comes to bullying and harassment? Yes, or no?

LIZ:

It can be harassment.

ELISE:

The answer is yes. And Dr. Gay at Harvard, does calling for the genocide of Jews violate Harvard's rules of bullying and harassment? Yes, or no?

CLAUDINE GAY:

It can be, depending on the context.

ELISE:

What's the context?

CLAUDINE:

Targeted at an individual.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

ELISE:

It's targeted at Jewish students, Jewish individuals. Do you understand your testimony is dehumanizing them? Do you understand that dehumanization is part of antisemitism? I will ask you one more time. Does calling for the genocide of Jews violate Harvard's rules of bullying and harassment? Yes, or no?

CLAUDINE:

Antisemitic rhetoric, when it crosses into conduct that amounts to bullying, harassment, intimidation, that is actionable conduct, and we do take action.

ELISE:

So, the answer is yes. That calling for the genocide of Jews violates Harvard's code of conduct, correct?

CLAUDINE:

Again, it depends on the context.

ELISE:

It does not depend on the context. The answer is yes, and this is why you should resign. These are unacceptable answers across the board.

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, do you think if representative Stefanik asks, at Harvard, does calling for the genocide of blacks violate Harvard's rules of bullying and harassment? Do you think she would have hesitated? Would she have said, it depends on context? What if she had said, at Harvard, does calling for the genocide of gays or transgenders violate Harvard's rules of bullying her and harassment? What do you think she would have said? Why does she hesitate when it comes to the Jews? And what does this have to do with your truth and my truth? We're going to unpack all that in this program today. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Back in two.

Ladies and gentlemen, when presidents of our most prestigious universities can't come right out and say that calling for the murder of Jews is wrong, we have a big problem. And I submit to you, you ought not be sending your kids to these universities. But that's another whole question right now, another whole podcast we could do. In fact, we did one a year or so ago when we did the podcast with Charlie Kirk called 'The College Scam.' And by the way, for those of you who are anywhere near Phoenix this weekend, Lord willing, I'll be at AmericaFest in Phoenix with Charlie Kirk and about 70 other speakers. So, if you're anywhere near Phoenix, and you want to be a part of a very encouraging few days, go to AmFest.com and be a part of it.

In any event, today, we are talking about what has happened on college campuses and what happened particularly with these three Ivy League presidents before Congress, how they couldn't really come out and say what they what everyone knows is wrong. At least reasonable

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

people know this is wrong. And now, they're backpedaling a little bit. First of all, President MaGill from Penn has been fired. However, President Gay from Harvard has not been fired. Harvard just doubled down and said we're going to defend her, even though she has lost the university, one report said one billion (that's billion with a B) dollars in donations since this occurred. And she's also been accused of plagiarism. And it appears that she did plagiarize part of her dissertation. We'll get to that a little bit later.

However, in an attempted damage control, she actually came out and apologized for what happened and what she said in her congressional testimony. And this is recorded in his story in the Harvard Crimson. That's the paper from Harvard University. This is a story. Again, we'll put the story in the show notes from December 8. And here's what it says. "Harvard President, Claudine Gay, apologized for her remarks at the end of her congressional testimony, which sparked fierce national criticism and led the leadership of Harvard Hillel, a Jewish group on campus, to say they don't trust her to protect Jewish students at the university."

Here's what Gay said. "I'm sorry. Words matter. When words amplify distress and pain, I don't know how you could feel anything but regret. Now, let me just say something. Notice how she isn't saying what she said was false. She's just saying that what she said amplified distress and pain. This is the MO of elites. They don't want to admit that they've really done anything truly morally wrong, because there is nothing that's truly morally wrong in their worldview, except their pet projects. Of course, you can't come out and say that same-sex behavior is wrong, or abortion is wrong, or oppression isn't wrong.

According to them, any kind of oppression is wrong. It's just how do you define oppression? And anybody who is somehow disadvantaged has been oppressed. It can't be because of any of the behavior that they exhibited. In other words, they have their own moral code, despite the fact that they don't really believe in objective moral codes. But we'll get to that a little bit later. Anyway, she went on to say this, President Gay that is. "There are some who have confused a right to free expression with the idea that Harvard will condone calls for violence against Jewish students." And she went on to say, we won't allow that. But ladies and gentlemen, it is not the people who have heard her rhetoric that are confused. She's the one that is confused about the balance between free expression and calling for the genocide of people. She was confused. Ms. Gay was confused.

And by the way, so was Liz MaGill, the president of Penn, who thankfully, is now the former president of Penn. She was fired just a few days after this, thankfully so. And I think some of the trustees at the University of Pennsylvania have been fired. And just to show you her confusion, that is President MaGill of Penn, here is Congressman Jim Banks, challenging her, President MaGill, about a Penn professor who was calling for violence against the Jews.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

JIM BANKS:

Why did Penn let Professor Ahmad Almallah off the hook, who led hundreds of students in chanting, "There's only one solution, Intifada Revolution"? Why does that professor still have a job at your university?

LIZ:

Representative, our approach to speech is as I identified. It follows and is guided by the United States Constitution with which allows for robust perspectives.

FRANK:

Yeah, robust perspectives. That's right. The U.S. Constitution does allow for robust perspectives. But it doesn't allow you to shout fire in a crowded theater when there is no fire. It doesn't allow you to explicitly call for the murder of innocent human beings. But that is exactly what you are suggesting the First Amendment allows you to do. It does not allow you to do that. There are limits to free speech. You can't use your free speech to literally call for the murder of innocent human beings. And if you're the president of a major university, like the University of Pennsylvania, and you don't know that distinction, you should not be the president. So, she resigned. And the same thing is true of President Gay, and the President of MIT. By the way, the President of MIT is Jewish, and she couldn't even come out and explicitly say this was wrong.

I mean, did you notice they all used the same rhetoric? Did you notice they all appeared to be coached? Talk about context. Just talk about context. Really? Context? What does context have to do with calling for the murder of innocent human beings based on their religion, based on their ethnicity? Not even based on their behavior, based on just their belief system. In fact, the damage had been done at Harvard. Because hours after this testimony, Rabbi David Wolpe resigned from an advisory group to combat antisemitism on campus that Gay established only weeks earlier.

He cited her congressional testimony and said, I can't believe this. She went to Congress, and actually couldn't say that calling for the murder of Jews was wrong. She had to talk about context, and it could lead to speech. Or I mean, the speech could lead to murder. And as Stefanik pointed out, they appeared to be saying, all three presidents appeared to be saying, it's only a problem if it actually leads to murder. If it doesn't lead to murder, well, then it's just okay. You can call for the murder of these people. They would never say that if someone explicitly called for the murder of blacks, gays, or transgendered, would they? Of course not. But that's where we are.

In fact, Gay went on in her apology interview to say this. "What I should have had the presence of mind to do in the moment was return to my guiding truth." Let me stop right here. My guiding truth, not the truth? Yeah, that's the problem right here. My guiding truth, which calls for violence against our Jewish community, threats to our Jewish students, have no place at Harvard and will never go unchallenged. She said, "I failed to convey what is my truth." All right. Let me stop

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

again. This is the core of the problem, ladies and gentlemen. This is probably what you're not going to hear other people say about this. Because, as you know, we deal on this podcast, the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast, with an evidence-based approach to why Christianity is true, and an evidence-based approach to why postmodernism and relativism are false.

First of all, when she says my truth, why is she apologizing at all? If it's just your truth, how can you be sorry for it? I mean, if everyone has his or her own moral authority themselves, if everyone has their own morality, there's never any reason to be sorry for anything because by definition, you cannot have done anything really wrong because you don't think anything's really wrong.

You just have your own personal standards that maybe you haven't lived up to, but so what? They're just your standards. That standard doesn't apply to other people. Why are you apologizing to other people? You have just violated your own personal standard. But what's wrong with that if there's really nothing wrong with anything? And as you know, ladies and gentlemen, there is no such thing as my truth or your truth. When someone says, there isn't the truth, only my truth, ask them, is that the truth or is it just your truth? Because if it's just your truth, why should I believe it? If it's just your opinion, why should I believe it?

But if you're saying the statement, there isn't the truth only my truth is the truth, well, the statement defeats itself because it is a the truth statement claiming there are no such thing as the true statements. The first half of the statement, there isn't the truth, only my truth, claims there aren't any the truths. Yet, you're claiming that statement is the truth. I know this can give you intellectual constipation, but that's because it's self-defeating. It's like saying, I can't speak a word in English. Look, it is really damning for the presidents of these major universities to basically just say, I have my own truth, and there is no the truth. That's essentially what they're saying. Then why would anyone go to Harvard, or MIT, or Penn?

Are they just there to learn the truth of the presidents or the professors, or are they there to learn the truth? I mean, if you're going to say you have your own truth, you might as well say I have my own math. There's no such thing as my math or your math. There's just math. Two plus two equals four for everyone. It's not my truth. It's not your truth. It's just the truth. And truth is what corresponds to reality. The problem is, too many people today deny reality, like Ivy League presidents.

They just deny reality. They have their own reality. Their own little world they're living in, their own little diversity, equity, and inclusion world, which isn't really about diversity, because they don't think people that disagree with them should be heard. That's not diversity. They don't think they should be included. They don't think those ideas are equal to their own ideas. And of course, they're right about that. But equity means that everybody gets the same thing. Well, not anybody that applies to Harvard gets the same thing, right?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

You can't get into Harvard unless you have certain SATs scores, unless you're...well, we'll get into that later, too. They got in trouble for treating different ethnic groups differently based on their qualifications. But it's still a meritocracy to a certain extent. You've got to have certain grades and certain scores to get into Harvard. Yet, they're all about equity. Well, why can't everybody get into Harvard then? A lot more on this. We're going to talk about the distinction between objective truth and subjective truth right 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 on the American Family Radio Network. Our website, CrossExamined.org. We're back in two minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to clear up something that may have been confusing to some of you listening to our Kingdom AI Project. That podcast was about a week ago, where we talked about the fact that we are creating our own proprietary AI to translate the best material that we have and the material of other apologists into the top 30 languages around the world. We want to bring the evidence of Jesus all around the world, and we're using AI to do it. And you may have thought on that program, wow. They're launching to reach the world with this. Are they still going to be doing what they do here in the United States? Yes.

We didn't mention that in the podcast. We didn't mention it in the video you need to see that explains what we're doing. But this is an additional goal to what we have been doing. As you know, we've been going to college campuses for many years. We're going to continue to do that. We've been going to high schools. We've been going to churches. We've been doing this podcast, two podcasts a week. We're even doing them in Spanish now. The great Jorge Gil and Diego Fallas are doing those. And you can go to our [CrossExamined Espanol](http://CrossExamined.org) YouTube channel and see some of that. And also, wherever you hear podcasts you can listen to Spanish ones.

But we're also going to be trying to do these things in other languages. And of course, we have a TV show, and we have a lot of social media going out. We're going to continue to do all that in addition to translating our best stuff, and the best stuff of other apologists into these top 30 languages. So, I wanted to clear that up. This is an additional goal. It's not going to stop us from doing what we've already been doing. And as you know, 100% of anything you donate is going to ministry. We don't have any buildings. It's 100% ministry, 0% buildings. If you want to see this bold, new initiative called The Kingdom AI Project, go to our website, CrossExamined.org. Click on donate. You'll see the video there.

And then, if you feel led to donate, your donations are going to be well-spent. Let me tell you, we're a very frugal ministry. We do a lot with a little. But we need your help, because we're going to have to double our budget over the next three years to make this happen. So, check that all out. Go to CrossExamined.org and click on Donate. You'll see it there. Thank you for considering us as you make your year-end donations.

Let's go back now to this discussion that we've been having on truth. In fact, let's draw a distinction between what some people call subjective truth and objective truth. Subjective truth is in the subject. It's just in you, the subject. It depends on what you think about something. Like

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

for example, you might say, well, chocolate ice cream tastes best. You know, that's an opinion. It's a preference. It's subjective to you. Somebody else might think vanilla tastes better, or whatever, right? Those are subjective truths. But objective truth is in the object outside of you. It's true regardless of what you think about it. Murder and rape are wrong regardless of what you think about it. The object, in this case, is God's morally perfect nature. He's the object, and that nature we're obligated to obey.

So, there is a distinction we can draw between subjective truth and objective truth. Now, when President Gay of Harvard comes out and says it's my truth that I think that murdering Jews is wrong. She's speaking as if it's just her preference. It's just her subjective preference. Like it's a subjective truth, like chocolate tastes better than vanilla. But we all know deep in our hearts, that's not just a subjective truth. It's an objective truth. It's wrong for all people, at all times, in all places, regardless of what she or anyone else thinks about it.

I mean, look. Ladies and gentlemen, if the Nazis had won World War II, and brainwashed everybody to believe that murdering Jews, homosexuals, gypsies, and the disabled, was really the right thing to do, would it have been the right thing to do? All the subjects think it's the right thing to do. Is it really the right thing to do? No. Even if they brainwashed everybody to believe that it would still be wrong because it's objectively wrong. It's in the object, God's nature, His morally perfect nature that we're obligated to obey. It's not just my opinion or your opinion. And yet, when you go to these universities, they will tell you it's objectively true that there are no objective truths. That everything is subjective. It's just your truth or my truth.

And they'll say the same thing about morality. There's no objective morality. It's just up to you. Yet, on one hand, they'll say that. On the other hand, they act as if their moral plan, their moral values are objectively true, like diversity, equity, and inclusion. They think that's true. They think same-sex behavior is good, and abortion is good, and mutilating children is good in the name of transgender ideology, and that we ought to do affirmative action for minorities. And we ought to have, not a level playing field, but we have to level the playing field somehow by disadvantaging certain groups and advantaging others. They think all those are objective, moral truths.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, last I checked, Harvard tuition is over \$57,000 a year. Do you think parents and students should be paying \$57K per year to learn Ms. Gay's truth, or the truth? Are they paying that money to learn her subjective preferences? Or are they paying that money to learn objective truths? I mean, when you go to the engineering department over there at Harvard, do you think the engineering profs think it's a subjective truth about the proper way to build a bridge or a building? No, of course not. It's objectively true. You just can't build it any way you want. And yet, the president of this institution just talks about things being her truth, my truth.

In fact, at another point in her testimony, she said, calling for the genocide of Jews is personally abhorrent to me. And she went on to say, we take action against those who call for the genocide of Jews. Well, first, how about the first point? It's personally abhorrent. Well, I hope it is. But it's

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

not just personally abhorrent. It's really abhorrent because it violates God's moral nature. And she says, we take action. Really? In another point of the testimony, Ms. Stefanik, the representative from New York, a Republican who rightfully went after these three presidents. And she said, really? Have students been expelled? I mean, you rescinded acceptance letters to prospective students because you found offensive speech in an old text. When one kid was 16, he apparently used the N word in a text. And so, his acceptance was rescinded. But has any action been taken when students today at Harvard call for the murder of Jews? Nope, no action.

Ben Shapiro has pointed out in his December 13 podcast that you ought to listen to. He goes into this quite a bit. He points out that there's Title IX training at Harvard that is required for all Harvard students. And it's basically just critical theory. It's basically oppressor and oppressed. We've been through this on this program before. This is the real core of where this kind of thinking comes from. The value isn't truth. The value isn't objective right and wrong. The value at these institutions is to put people into groups, the oppressor group and the oppressed group, and anybody in the oppressed group can never be wrong. These folks in the oppressor group can never be right. And those folks in the oppressor group must be disadvantaged, and the folks in the oppressed group must be advantaged.

And this Title IX training actually talks about, if you're a heterosexual, white male and you think that's normal, (the heterosexual part), that's somehow a form of discrimination. And if someone were to say at Harvard, there are only two genders. Men can't be women and women can't be men. According to this kind of training, that kind of rhetoric would be considered hate speech. But genocide of the Jews? No, that's just fine. Really? Now, by the way, ladies and gentlemen, we all know heterosexual behavior is normal. I mean, it better be. I mean, not just morally but practically. I mean, think about this, ladies and gentlemen. What would happen to society if everyone lived faithfully, in say, heterosexual natural marriage? Well, so many of our problems would vanish.

Of course, divorce would vanish, child abuse would be greatly reduced, abortion would be reduced quite a bit, maybe completely. Taxes would go down. Why? Because the reason some of our taxes have risen to such incredible levels, is because the government has bloated itself to take care of the casualties of the broken family. If a family stays together, everything turns out much better for children. But when families break up, as you know, the results on children are devastating. And that leads to crime, and it leads to welfare, and it leads to bloated government, which leads to higher taxes. And it then leads to two parents having to both work, which means kids even in homes that have two parents don't have the kind of parenting they once had when one parent stayed home. I mean, it's just a big cycle. Heterosexuality, heterosexual marriage is good for a society. But what would happen if everyone lived faithfully in same-sex marriage? Well, obviously, society would vanish in a generation or two.

So, to say that heterosexuality is normal and good for society is true. And yet, Harvard would say, that's some sort of discrimination. Now, the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, thefire.org, go there if you want to see how these schools rate on free speech,

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

academic freedom, due process, and even press freedom. Those are the four things, this organization, thefire.org. Not a Christian organization, by the way. Not run by Christians. But these people keep track of what's happening on college campuses.

And where do you think both the University of Pennsylvania and Harvard University rank in terms of free speech and academic freedom? Where do you think they rank? At the very bottom, Harvard is last, and the University of Pennsylvania is second to last. And when you look at the data from thefire.org, it just shows you what must be being taught at these universities, because the results are shocking. And right after the break, we're going to delve into them. And then we're going to get into a little bit more about why President Gay is still the president there, and how the DEI: Diversity Equity and Inclusion nonsense that is being pushed there, actually hurts her personally and hurts all minorities. Much more after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me Frank Turek. Don't go anywhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, I've mentioned this. At the end of the last podcast, which was I don't think broadcast on the American Family Radio Network. We have two podcasts a week. This one is obviously broadcast on AFA if you're listening to it on AFA. But the midweek podcast is not broadcast there. And I mentioned a book that me and our graphic designer Keith Carter put together. It is actually a comic book that sums up the book 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist.' It'll take you maybe, I don't know, 10-15 minutes to read. And it's a book written for people that won't read a full book on the evidence for Christianity. It's a comic book, and you can only get it at ImpactApologetics.com That's the CrossExamined store. Just go to CrossExamined.org and click on store. You'll see it there.

It's 'The Four-Point Case for Mere Christianity.' There's a hardcover edition in full color. We only have a few of those left. And then there's a softcover edition. This is a great stocking stuffer. But you've got to order it like today or tomorrow if you're going to ensure you're going to get it before Christmas. So, go to CrossExamined.org. Click on store. You'll see it there. It is a great little piece. And Keith, who is an amazing artist. He's actually won Emmys for his art. And yeah, it was an Emmy with ABC. He did something for a TV program. He's also worked for Disney, and the NFL, and many other organizations. So, he's a great artist. You should check that out.

Also, don't forget in January, we've got two new online courses. One of them is the 'Why I Still Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist' course. This course, ladies and gentlemen, is brand-new even though we've run it several times. We've updated it with 10 new hours of video, a completely new workbook, and all that. And if you take the premium version, you'll be on at least I think six or eight occasions with me, LIVE Q&A via Zoom. It starts mid-January. That's for anybody high school and up. And you need to sign up soon because we limit the number of people in the class. And if you want to take the sixth to eighth grade version with me and Shanda Fulbright, that also starts in January. It's called 'Let's Get Real.' That's for sixth to eighth graders. So, if you've got a homeschooler or even not a homeschooler who just wants to learn why Christianity is true.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And by the way, this is why you've got to learn why Christianity is true if you go to college, because you're going to get the kind of bilge we've been talking about here today, from these Ivy League institutions. And in most colleges, you're going to get this postmodern, relativistic, there is no truth nonsense, and you've got to be ready to stand firm. So, take those courses. Go to [CrossExamined.org](https://www.crossexamined.org). Click on online courses. You'll see it there.

Now, before the break, I was talking about thefire.org because they rate these colleges on what the campus climate is. And Harvard ranks dead last. Seventy percent of students say shouting down a speaker to prevent them from speaking on campus is at least rarely acceptable. Seventy percent of students. Fifty-three percent of students say they have self-censored on campus at least once or twice a month. And 58% of students say they are worried about damaging their reputation because someone misunderstands something they have said or done. And they've also discovered at The Fire that for every one conservative students at Harvard, there are roughly 3.3 liberal students. Here's some comments from students.

Every time we are instructed to introduce ourselves by stating our pronouns, I feel like I'm being judged. In fact, let me get the right context here. These students were asked this. Please share a moment where you personally felt you could not express your opinion on your campus. And this Harvard University student said, every time we're instructed to introduce ourselves by stating our pronouns. Another student said, I try to avoid telling people I support Israel or that is where I'm going this summer. I just say I'm going abroad because I don't want to be judged. That's a class of 2025 student. A class of 2023 student said, I've had many moments where I didn't want to disagree with the most woke take during class for fear of backlash.

This is from Harvard. How about Penn, which ranks second to dead last? I think Harvard was something like 249th and Penn was 248th. Similar situation there. Seventy-nine percent of students say you can shout down a speaker. That's at least acceptable sometimes. Fifty-one percent said they've self-censored themselves. Fifty-five percent said they're worried about damaging their reputation because someone misunderstands what they've said or done. And get this, at the University of Pennsylvania, for every one conservative student, there are roughly 7.7 liberal students.

Friends, if you're sending your kids to these places, first of all, why? Second, if you think there aren't alternatives to higher education, get Charlie Kirk's book, 'The College Scam.' Go to page 222. He'll show you a number of ways you can get a great education without ever going to college. Now I know there are some professions where you've got to go to college. You know, if you want to be a professor or you want to be a military officer, you want to be a doctor, a lawyer, an engineer, okay. You've got to go to college but choose wisely. Go to Hillsdale, go to Liberty. Go to a place where you're not going to get as much of this nonsense as you're going to get going to the University of Pennsylvania.

Anyway, here's what the University of Pennsylvania students have said. Here's where they feel that they couldn't express their opinion. Get this, lack of support for Jewish issues. Antisemitism

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

is not thought of as a valid issue. This is what students are saying. And now the President had to resign because yeah, it wasn't a valid issue for her. She couldn't say in front of Congress, that calling for the genocide of Jews was wrong. She had to say, it depends on context. Yeah, nonsense. What context do you need calling for the murder of innocent human beings? I mean, there's no justification for it, and they couldn't say it.

Now, you know what President Gay over at Harvard did? This is just in the New York Post the 13th, just a couple days ago. Here's the headline. 'Embattled Harvard President Claudine Gay attends menorah lighting after widespread antisemitism backlash.' You know, I'm reminded of something Rush Limbaugh used to say. He was spot on when he said this. He would say leftism or liberalism is all symbolism over substance. I mean, this is pure symbolism over substance. He's absolutely right. Lighting a menorah? Instead of lighting a menorah, why don't you go after the people on your own campus who are calling for the murder of Jews? It's all just symbolism. You don't actually do anything. You just talk about how you're for the Jews all the sudden after you were exposed for not being for them in front of Congress, in front of the whole world.

Now on Ben Shapiro's December 13 program, which you ought to listen to, he points out, there's also evidence that President Gay plagiarized her dissertation. In fact, I know who she plagiarized from, Professor Carol Swain. I've had Carol on this program before. Professor Swain is saying, yes. She basically took my whole dissertation practically. And you know what Harvard has done? They've covered the whole thing up. They said they were going to investigate it. Instead, they fired off a 15-page letter (according to The New York Post anyway) from an attorney to the New York Post. They said, don't investigate this or we're going to say this is defamation of character.

Now, MaGill has been fired, but Gay cannot be according to Ben Shapiro. Why? Because she's a diversity hire. We can't say that. By the way, here's how the Babylon be dealt with this plagiarism charge. Here's their headline. I love The Babylon Bee. Seth Dillon, the president's a friend of mine. But even if he wasn't a friend of mine, these people are brilliant. Kyle Mann is brilliant. He's the editor. He's a friend of mine too. But listen to this. 'Claudine Gay responds to plagiarism accusations by giving inspiring I Have a Dream speech.' They have a picture of her like she's Martin Luther King.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, can I say something that all of us are thinking, but few of us will say out loud? Can I say it? I'm going to say it. She's obviously a diversity hire. And you're thinking that, aren't you? And you're not thinking that because you are a racist. You're thinking that because Harvard is racist. It's part of their policies. It's part of their stated policies. They're looking for minorities to fill roles. They're looking for the woke. It's part of their training. It's part of what she admits. You're not the racist, she is. You're not the racist. Harvard is claiming, and by their own slapped down affirmative action policy, slapped down by the Supreme Court.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

They were admitting black students with SAT scores 126 points lower than Asian students. Asian students, in other words, had to be 126 points better to make it to Harvard than black students. Why? Because of what they believe Harvard does. They believe in this critical theory nonsense. And that's why there are people out there who are clearly minorities, and would be minorities in Gaza, like same sex attracted people, the LGBTQ people.

They are supporting Hamas, even though, tragically, they would be the first people thrown off buildings if they went to Gaza. Why are they doing this? Because these people buy into anybody who is considered oppressed has to be right. And anybody who is considered an oppressor, according to their evaluation of who is an oppressor and who is oppressed, has to be wrong. So, they're all going to stick together. At least the LGBTQ people will stick together with Hamas. But Hamas is not going to stick together with the LGBTQ people. They're going to admittedly, murder them. This is the kind of madness that happens on a college campus.

And this affirmative action nonsense actually hurts the people it's supposed to help. Because people just look at Claudine Gay, and they go, she's got to be a diversity hire. Now, she's proven she's a diversity hire because obviously what she said, she doesn't appear to be very bright. She doesn't appear to be someone who's going to stand for the truth. She just is going to stand for her truth. And that's the bottom line, ladies and gentlemen. According to all this, there isn't my truth to your truth. There's just the truth. There's not my morality, your morality, there's the morality. I know that's not what Harvard's teaching. That's what I'm saying.

Now, this doesn't mean every moral issue is clear. But it certainly means that what Hamas did to innocent women and children, murder and rape is wrong, and calling for more of it is wrong. And when these presidents can't say it's wrong, they shouldn't be presidents anymore. They ought to all resign. Alright, ladies and gentlemen, that's my take anyway. It's not just my truth. It's the truth. You know it. See you here next week, Lord willing.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

