

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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

## Can We Really Believe the Bible is Inerrant? Plus More Q&A

(March 19, 2024)

### FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, can we really believe that the Bible is inerrant? That's a question that's been sent in. There are a few other questions we hope to get to today. Like if everything happens for a reason, do we still have freewill? And does getting rewards in heaven contradict the parable of the landowner? We'll talk about that. And then we also have a question about the Big Bang and Genesis. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek. We're normally on the American Family Radio Network on our weekend podcast. But this is the midweek podcast where we don't have any interruptions and we just try and answer questions or we have long form interviews.

If you don't know about our podcast that is broadcast on the American Family Radio Network, you can listen to both of them wherever you get podcasts. As you know, it's called I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. Please tell others about it. And thank you for putting positive reviews wherever you listen to podcasts. It helps the podcast be seen by other people. All right let's get a question from Luke, who writes in, I have a question about the inerrancy of the Bible. Personally, I believe the Bible is divinely inspired. But I struggle with the idea that it is completely perfect. Even though it is inspired by God, it is written by man, and nothing that man does is perfect.

Let me end right here. If that were true, unfortunately, your statement couldn't be considered good, or right, or true, or perfect. When you say nothing that man does is perfect, well, you're actually making a claim here that says nothing that man does is perfect. Well, if nothing that man does is perfect, we shouldn't trust anything anyone says because we're implying that there's got to be an error in what they said somewhere. And that's just not true. Yes, it is true that human beings do err. But it is not true that human beings always err. In other words, there are many other books out there that are inerrant, other than the Bible.

Most kid's books are inerrant. Okay, math books where all the numbers are right, and all the equations are properly solved, those books are inerrant. But as far as we know, there's only one book that's inspired by God in the sense that it is inerrant revelation from Him. We can write inerrant books ourselves. But that doesn't mean that God has somehow told us to write these things in some way. And as you probably know, there's a dispute over what it really means to be inspired. Does it mean dictation that God specifically said you need to write exactly these words? Most Bible scholars say no. That's not the theory of divine inspiration. There are other theories. We don't have time to get into it here. But the point here is that yes, human beings err, but they don't always err.

Luke goes on to say this, Jesus even seems to explain that the Scripture is not perfect when speaking about the ability to get a divorce in ancient Israel. If Moses adapted God's law

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

because the hearts of the Israelites were hard, couldn't it have been adapted in other areas? Thank you, Luke. Oh, yeah, good question, Luke. You're referring to Matthew 19:8, where Jesus says that Moses granted you a certificate of divorce because your hearts were hard although it was not meant to be this way from the beginning. Okay? He's saying that your hearts were so hard that Moses said, okay, if you need a divorce, in certain circumstances I will allow it, even though that's not really what I want. God somehow accommodated to the hard situation that was going on in ancient Israel at the time. And couldn't God do that in other areas?

Of course He could do it in other areas. The question is, does He? Has He adapted Himself to bring people along incrementally? And that would have to be revealed, Luke. It is revealed when it came to divorce in the Old Testament, but it's not revealed elsewhere as far as I know, unless you come up with another example. We have to go by what God tells us, not what we think he could have told us if He wanted to. So, I think that's very important to look into this on a case by case basis. By the way, this idea of incrementalism, I think, is something that has applications today, particularly on these contentious issues that we have in our country, particularly abortion.

Obviously, I think that the Scripture teaches that thou shalt not murder and that an unborn child is a human being. In fact, maybe the clearest place it says that, that your unborn child is a human being, is when Elizabeth and Mary meet and they're both pregnant. And it talks about the baby leaping in the womb. That's a human being in there. And if the laws of say, California, were in place in ancient Israel, Mary could have aborted Jesus and Elizabeth could have aborted John the Baptist. They are people from the very beginning. Now, they're not fully formed people, but a two year old isn't fully formed.

In their essence, they're human beings even though they're not fully formed. Most people are not fully formed. We're still growing, we're still changing. You know, most obviously, children are not fully formed. Adults are but we still change. So, changing either our intelligence or our physical stature doesn't change the fact that we're made in the image of God, and that we're human beings, and that we ought to be protected. Now, back to this idea of abortion with regards to incrementalism. I think from a political standpoint, although human beings are human beings from the moment of conception, I think that we can say, I want to save some lives, even if right now I can't save all lives. So, if someone were to say, okay, let's have a law that says, like Ron DeSantis, put in Florida that said, let's have a law that restricts abortion after six weeks.

Now, do I think there's a human being at five weeks? Of course I do. But I'm willing, if I can save every baby after six weeks to do that, rather than save no babies by saying no, unless I can get everybody saved right now, I'm going to save nobody. Well, the people in Florida are not ready for a complete ban on abortion. They need to be brought along incrementally. So, if we can get most abortions stopped, if we could save most lives, let's do that rather than saving no lives. In fact, the nominee for the Republicans, Trump has been saying, oh, we've got to compromise on this somewhere. We've got to have a solution somewhere. Let's see where that goes. It might be better than saving no lives.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

In fact, it is better than saving no lives. The problem is for Trump and others, this issue properly is now in the hands of the state. It's not really a federal issue anymore. It's a state issue. And so, some states, like Missouri have pretty much outlawed abortion where California is now celebrating abortion. Everybody can come get an abortion here. In fact, we'll pay for you to come here and get an abortion, we'll pay for your abortion. That's complete depravity as described in Romans 1. But that's what's going on in states like California, where other states like Missouri, and maybe Mississippi, and a few others have said, no. You're not going to have abortion here.

But incrementalism is something that I think is a plausible and wise thing to do if you can't save all babies because you can't get a law passed to save all babies. But if you can get a law passed to save some babies, then go ahead and do so. Save some and then continue to work on the populace, educating them, pointing out that this is a human being from the very beginning at a later date. Maybe you can save more babies, maybe all of them. Now, by the way, look. There's a great book that can help you on this issue of inerrancy. And that book is called, 'When Critics Ask.' Well, it used to be called that. That's the version I have. It was renamed. It's now called 'The Big Book of Bible Difficulties' by Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe. I highly recommend you get that book because it will help you on questions of inerrancy.

Now inerrancy is a kind of internal doctrine that Christians argue over and Christians debate over, but it's not something you ought to be debating with an unbeliever. In other words, you don't have to say, in order for you to be a Christian, you have to accept that the Bible is inerrant. The early Apostles and the early church fathers who understood that Jesus had risen from the dead didn't go around saying when they were evangelizing in the book of Acts, they didn't go around saying, in order for you to be a Christian, you have to believe this entire Old Testament is inerrant. What they did is they said, we have evidence that Jesus rose from the dead. In fact, we saw Him risen. And they talked about the resurrection. In fact, there was no New Testament when Christianity originally began. Christianity did not begin with a book. It began with an event, the resurrection.

And so, there was no divine book, at least from a New Testament perspective to say, in order for you to be a Christian, you have to believe this. There were thousands of Christians before a line of the New Testament was ever written because they didn't read about this in a book. They witnessed Jesus rise from the dead. Christianity did not begin with a book. It began with an event. So, this question of inerrancy is something that the Bible talks about, the New Testament documents talk about. And when they talk about it, many times they're talking about the Old Testament. And there are places where New Testament writers refer to other New Testament writers as being Scripture. Peter refers to Paul as being Scripture. And Paul seems to refer to the Gospel of Luke, a section of it, as being Scripture.

But most of the time when they're talking about the Scripture, they're talking about the Old Testament because that's all that existed, at least initially when Christianity began. So, inerrancy is something that I think is true because it's taught in the Bible and Jesus believed in

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

it. And if Jesus believes in something, I'm going to believe it too. I just have a personal policy. If somebody predicts and accomplishes His own resurrection from the dead, I just trust whatever the guy says. And that's what Jesus did. Now, you say well, you're using the Bible to prove the Bible. How do you know? How do you know what Jesus said?

Because when you look at the New Testament documents, you don't have to assume they're inerrant to figure out what happened. In fact, scholars that study this, whether they're atheists, or Christian, or anywhere in between, they pull truths out of the New Testament documents because they're historical documents. And they can use certain tests to try and discover whether certain things that either happened or were said as recorded in those documents really did happen. They use the principle of embarrassment, the principle of multi-attestation, the principle of dissimilarity. Jesus says something that no one has ever said before. Oh, well, then He probably did say that then. It's not like He's just reflecting something from the Old Testament. And there are many other tests.

Multiple attestation is something that many different writers say, well, if more than one says it, that's better evidence that it really happened. It's embarrassing if Jesus is called a drunkard, or He's called demon possessed, or He's called a madman, or His own brothers don't believe in Him, or Peter their leader is called Satan, or Peter denies Christ three times, or the women are the first witnesses while the sissy pants men run away. These are all embarrassing things that nobody would invent.

Or the fact that the New Testament disciples when they're being given the Great Commission by Jesus in Galilee as recorded at the end of the Gospel of Matthew. When they say some believed but some doubted, they're not making that up. Who would say they were doubting the Lord when He's standing resurrected right in front of them? When you see these kinds of things in the texts, scholars who have common sense go, they're not making this up.

And there's enough known about what Jesus really did say and do by those criteria to say that Jesus thought the Old Testament was the Word of God. And He also promised the New Testament. Now, the book, 'The Big Book of Bible Difficulties' gets into some of the mistakes we make when we try and talk about inerrancy. And we also bring up some of these mistakes in chapter 14 of the book 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist.' Let me just give you a few of these and then we'll move on to some other questions.

One mistake we make when we look at the Bible and we say, well, it can't be inerrant. Look at this discrepancy. One mistake we make is assuming that divergent accounts are contradictory. Like, for example, one Gospel might say, well, there was one angel at the tomb and another mentions two. Is that a contradiction? No, it's just a difference. Why? Because it doesn't say there was only one angel. It simply mentions one. So, if there was two, there certainly was one.

If I see somebody at a restaurant, and I say, hey, John was at the restaurant and somebody else says, John and Mary, were at the restaurant, are those two accounts contradictory or

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

complimentary? They're not contradictory. They're complimentary. One of them just mentioned, John. The other one mentioned John and Mary. So, just because something is different doesn't mean that it's a contradiction. And if all the Gospels described the happenings of the New Testament in exactly the same language with all the same details, the critics would be claiming they just copied from one another.

But you know what eyewitnesses do? As our friend J. Warner Wallace, who's an expert in eyewitness testimony will tell you, eyewitnesses always tell you the essential event that occurred. But they may disagree on the minor details. In fact, this is even true of the sinking of the Titanic. Eyewitnesses agreed that the Titanic sank, but they disagree on how it sank. Some say it went down whole. Others say, well, it broke in two before it went down. Oh, that's hopelessly contradictory. There's no way we can believe that the Titanic sank. No, that's what they all agree on. They all agree it sank. They disagree on how it sank. Well, now you might ask yourself, how do you know what happened then?

We know it sank, but how did it sink? And why do they have different perspectives on this? Well, first of all, it was dark. Second of all, they were probably in shock. Third of all, it depends on what angle they were looking at the boat, right? I mean, if they're at the beam of the boat, if they're seeing the boat from the side, maybe they could see it broke in two. But if they're on the bow of the stern and they couldn't see it break in two, they said it went down whole. It was just their perspective. It's not a contradiction. It's not like they were lying about it. It was just their perspective. They had different eyewitness accounts. Now we know what actually happened. Why? Because there's ocean archaeology. We went down and we saw the Titanic was actually broken in two. But that's not something that should cause us to say the Titanic didn't sink.

The same thing is true when it comes to the resurrection. We all agree, or I should say, all the witnesses agree on the big issue. What? Jesus rose from the dead. There may be differences on who got to the tomb first, how many people saw Jesus at the tomb, or who raced who to the tomb. You know, all these things that the critics go, oh, it's hopelessly contradictory. No, it's not. It's not hopelessly contradictory. They are different perspectives. And even if they were contradictory on these minor points, it doesn't negate the bigger point that Jesus rose from the dead.

Even if the eyewitnesses of the Titanic disagree on how it sank, what does everybody agree on? It sank. That's the point. Obviously, there are other problems when you're trying to interpret the Scripture, like failing to understand the context of the passage or presuming that the Bible approves all it records. You know, the Bible describes the polygamy of Solomon. But that doesn't mean it's affirming polygamy. The Bible describes the adultery of David and Bathsheba, but that doesn't mean it's prescribing it. It's just describing it. In fact, most of what the Bible reveals is just a description, not a prescription. It's just saying, this is what happened. And there's a lot of sin that's recorded in the Bible. Doesn't mean God approves of it.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

Here's another one we get wrong. And we look at where we think we found an error in the Bible is forgetting that the Bible is a human book with human characteristics. And here's what we write in 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist.' Critics have been known to falsely impugn the integrity of the Bible by expecting a level of expression higher than that which is customary for a human document. However, this is illegitimate because most of the Bible was not verbally dictated but written by human authors. An exception is the 10 Commandments, which were written with the finger of God. See Exodus 31:18.

The writers were human composers who employed their own literary styles and idiosyncrasies. They wrote historical narratives like Acts, poetry like The Song of Solomon, prayers which of course, many of the psalms are. Prophecy like Isaiah, personal letters like 1 and 1 Timothy, theological treatises like Romans, and other types of literature. These writers speak from a human standpoint when they write of the sun rising or setting. They also reveal human thought patterns, including memory lapses. Like when Paul says, I don't remember who I baptized in 1 Corinthians. He's just being honest. But it's true that he didn't remember who he baptized. He's telling the truth. But it points out that he's just revealing what he remembers and doesn't remember. It's true what he remembers and doesn't remember, as well as human emotions.

Paul, at one point tells the Galatians who are trying to follow the Judaizers, the people who say you still need to follow the Old Testament law in order to be a Christian, and particularly circumcision. He goes home and says, I wish they would go all the way and just emasculate themselves, like human emotions. [Laughter] He's fired up over this. In short, since God used the styles of about 40 authors over nearly 1500 years to get His message across, it's wrong to expect the level of expression to be greater than that of other human documents.

However, as with Christ's human nature, the Bible's distinct human nature is without error. And as I mentioned earlier, there are other inerrant books than the Bible. We write them all the time. If we write a book that doesn't have any errors in it, it's inerrant. Yes, human beings err, but they don't always err. Can you be a Christian and not believe in inerrancy? Yes. You're just disagreeing with Jesus, and that's never a good place to be.

But what you do is you point out that God exists, and Jesus rose from the dead. And then when people become Christians, then you go further into these doctrines and point out that the Bible is indeed inerrant. And in fact, Augustine had something. I'm trying to remember from memory now. And I have a memory lapse myself. But Augustine said that if you think you found an error in the Bible, either the manuscript is faulty, because we know that copyists make errors when they copy a manuscript. But since we have so many different manuscripts, we can reconstruct the original. In other words, it's easy to detect the copyist errors they make.

So, Augustine would say, if you think you found an error in the Bible, either the manuscript is faulty, or the translation is wrong, or you just have not understood it. And that, essentially, the third one is probably the one that gets most of us. We just don't understand what it's saying. And we have to keep doing research to figure out what it says. Like, is it more likely that God

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

has made an error in the Scripture? Or is it more likely that Frank Turek just is ignorant? Yeah, B. [Laughter] Frank Turek is just ignorant. He hasn't figured it out yet. But the more you study this, the more you realize, ah, there is a solution here that I didn't understand. I didn't see beforehand. And that's what the book, 'The Big Book of Bible Difficulties' will help you with. So, Luke, I know it's a long answer to your question, but it's a big topic. So, check out the book, 'The Big Book of Bible Difficulties,' and the rest of you can as well.

All right, Frank, Chad writes. Longtime fan of your show. I appreciate your willingness to tackle some of the most controversial topics of today's world and how you take complex challenges and topics and put them into simple terms. Well, thank you, Chad. Here is my question. Firstly, I am on the side that we have free will to choose or reject Christ and to do the same in everyday life, including whether or not we choose to sin or not. Quite frequently, we hear from other believers, that everything happens for a reason. On one side, it would seem to me that if the sin, "happened for a reason," then the person committing the sin didn't genuinely choose to commit the sin and it was simply part of a preordained chain of events. On the other hand, if the person had the freewill to choose to sin, then the consequences don't fall into the category that it happens for a reason.

Alright, let's point out here, Chad, I think the confusion is that we're confusing knowledge and causality. Just because God knows what we are going to do doesn't mean He's causing us to do it. I mean, you know things that are going to happen that you're not causing them to happen. For example, you might know that the sun's going to rise in the east tomorrow. But that doesn't mean you're causing it to rise. A newborn baby may be put down by her mother one night and the mother knows that in the middle of the night, the baby's going to wake up and want to eat. She knows it's going to happen, but she's not causing the baby to wake up in the middle of the night.

And by the way, the same thing is true with God. God is outside of time. He knows the end from the beginning. When He elects to create a universe, no matter what universe He creates, He knows the outcome because He's outside of time. He knows all things. He knew we'd be doing this podcast right now. But He's not causing us to do it. He's not causing me to talk and you to listen. We're both doing that freely. He just knew we would do that. And it's unavoidable with God if He knows all things, and He knows all possible contingencies, then He knows no matter what universe He creates, He's going to know what happens. But He's not causing us to do it. It's still happening for a reason.

God can bring good even from our sin, but He's not causing us to sin. And this is one of the big faults with Calvinism, as you know. If God makes all the choices, He makes all the choices for us to sin, which means God is the author of evil and He's not Yahweh. He's now suddenly Allah. And we talked about this a couple of weeks ago when we had Tim Stratton on when we were talking about the doctrine or system of thought called molinism. Go back and listen to that program or get the book 'Faith Examined' because Tim has a very good chapter on molinism in that book 'Faith Examined.'

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

'Faith Examined' is a book put together by CIA graduates, the CrossExamined Instructor Academy graduates, and they did about 10 of them. And they put all these chapters together. Molinism is one of the chapters that is in the book that Dr. Tim Stratton wrote, and it deals with this issue. Now, you could also think about it this way. And by the way, while I'm mentioning CIA, I want to mention that the CrossExamined Instructor Academy is coming up this August in Charlotte, North Carolina if you want to be a part of it. You want to learn how to better present and you want to learn how to better answer questions, then go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on Events. You'll see CIA there.

I'll be one of the instructors. We have 10 instructors. So, it's me, Greg Koukl, Natasha Crain, Alisa Childers, Allen Parr, Bobby Conway, Brett Kunkel, several others. You can just go to that website [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on Events. You'll see CIA. You have to apply. We want people who have some experience in apologetics. You don't have to be a PhD or anything. But we want people that really want to take this to the next level. And for the first time ever, we're allowing a non-presentation track. So, if you just want to come and learn from many of these apologists in an intimate setting but you don't necessarily want to do a presentation, we're opening it up for you as well. So, go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on Events, you'll see it there.

You can be a part of this if you want to be. And it's a great place to learn from these apologists you might not have an opportunity to learn from in an intimate setting. We'll have lunch together; we'll have breaks together. You can ask anything you want. And then you can also get evaluated if you want to be a part of that. So, check all that out [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Okay, back to Chad's question. Let's think about this from 30,000 feet. Either this world, and your life, and my life has ultimate meaning, or it does not. Only if God exists do our lives have ultimate meaning. If God does not exist, this world and your life have no ultimate meaning. My life has no ultimate meaning. We're just going to become worm food at some point, and it's all over.

But since God is outside of time, and we could talk about the cosmological argument to show that space, time, and matter had a beginning. Since God is outside of time, whatever created time must be outside of time must be timeless. God is outside of time, since He knows all possible universes and contingencies. In other words, He created this universe knowing how it would turn out. Again, go back and listen to the molinism podcast with Tim Stratton a couple of weeks ago. He knows how it's going to turn out. So, when we reach the final state, whether it's heaven or hell, everything will have happened for a reason to bring forth that final state.

Now, we can't always track how a particular event leads to that final state. But God can. He can see the ripple effect. And the ripple effect is that every event that occurs in this life affects trillions of other events. They ripple forward. You can just think in your own life. I mean, how did you even get here? Well, your parents had to meet, and their parents had to meet, and then their parents had to meet prior to that. You are one conclusion to trillions of ripples that ever occurred in your ancestor's lives. You wouldn't even exist if all of these events ultimately led to

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

your creation. You can't trace all those ripples. No finite mind can, but God can. And this is one of the answers to the problem of evil.

That even though we can't see any good coming out of an awful event, since there is a ripple effect, and God is outside of time, He can see how even an event that looks bad can ultimately bring forth good. We've talked about this quite a bit on this program. I think it's very good insight, the ripple effect. So, despite the fact that we can sin and violate God's moral will, He can still get His ultimate will done through our free will. In fact, I think God is so sovereign that He can get his will done through our free will. If you're a Calvinist and you say, oh, no, God can't do that. If God gives us free will, He's not sovereign. What you're saying is that God is not sovereign enough to get His will done through our free will.

You're saying that God has to stack the deck in His favor to get done what He wants done, that He has to control everything, that He has to play both sides of the chessboard. Well, that's not very impressive, if He controls everything without allowing freewill in order to get His will done. Then you're saying He's not really sovereign. God is so sovereign that He can give us free will and still get what He wants done. Ultimately, that's what He does. This is why by the way, ladies and gentlemen, an eternal perspective is so important. And read 2 Corinthians 4 if you want Paul to instruct you on how important an eternal perspective is. It's a passage on suffering. And he talks about how we need to have an eternal perspective.

Yeah, things here on Earth may look bleak. Things here on Earth we go, I don't know why this is happening and this is awful. I can't see any good coming from it. I can't see any good reason coming from this. Of course you can't. You're a blip inside of time. You have very limited knowledge. You hardly know what's going on. Now, you only have a fragmentary view of history, and you have no idea what's going to happen in the future, save the revelation of God. And you think that's enough for you to say, oh, there's no good reason for this happening. You and I don't have the capacity that God has to see how everything can happen for a reason.

And even sin can happen for a reason, an ultimate reason that God can redeem. In fact, that's the whole theme of the Bible, redemption. My friend, Ray Ciervo, who is an apologist up in New Jersey has a good way of putting this. You want to sum up the entire Bible? You want to sum up the world? In fact, what's the answer to the question what's wrong with the world? Here it is in three short sentences. God created it. We broke it. Jesus fixed it. God created it. We broke it. Jesus fixed it. Yes, the theme of the entire Bible is redemption. Jesus fixes the problems that we created. That's what it's all about. And He can do it.

Another question from Luke says this. Frank, I listen to your podcast. And you often say that people will receive different rewards in heaven. How do you square that belief with parables such as the landowner and the laborers where laborers worked for different amounts of time, yet they all received the same payment? Yeah, I think here, Luke, Jesus is talking about salvation by faith. In other words, or let me put it another way, he's talking about salvation by grace through faith. That no matter when these people are hired by the landowner, they're all paid the

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

same amount. That's salvation. In other words, He's talking about the results of justification, not the results of sanctification. Justification is your admission into heaven. It's completely by grace.

If God wants somebody to come to Him and the person is willing, and He wants everybody to be saved. That's another problem with Calvinism. They don't think God wants everyone to be saved, even though it says in several places God wants everyone to be saved. If God wants everybody to be saved, and He does. He can save them early in life, halfway through life, or at the very end of life, and they're all going to be in heaven. That's what the results are. That's basically the moral of the parable of the landowner. But he's not talking about sanctification. See, there's a difference between your admission into heaven and your seat when you get there. If you want to use a stadium analogy, you are admitted free of charge based on what Christ has done, but your seat is determined by your good works.

In fact, a better description of this might be the parable of the talents. What does God do? Or what does Jesus say is done to the guy that buries his talent? He takes his talent, and he gives it to the guy who doubled his talents. In other words, He's rewarding people based on justice. He doesn't believe in equity. You see, in our culture today, people are trying to say everyone has to wind up in the same place, everyone has to get the same thing. That's not what the Bible says. You're not going to have equity in heaven. Why? Because rightfully so, some people are going to get more rewards than other people because they deserve it.

Now, we're all in heaven because of grace. But our rewards are based on our good works. That's what the Scripture teaches. So, I just think Luke, the parable of the landowner is dealing with your admission into heaven, where maybe the parable of the talents is dealing with, okay, what are you going to get when you get there? And you might say, well, how can that be? Won't I be jealous of somebody else if they have more? No, you won't, because you won't have the sin nature anymore. And you're going to know it's perfectly just that this person has more than you. In fact, it's been put this way.

Some people who really pursued God here are going to shine like a 100 watt bulb, a perfect 100 watt bulb in heaven. Whereas somebody who just made it into heaven by the skin of their teeth might be a 15 watt bulb. But that 15 watt bulb is going to shine perfectly as a 15 watt bulb, and that 100 watt bulb is going to shine perfectly as a 100 watt bulb. In other words, the capacity that they have developed in this life is going to be perfectly represented in heaven. Alright, let's go on to Vitali who writes this.

Hi, Frank, how does the Big Bang correlate with Genesis 1-2? In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, which is time, space, and matter. This is clear. However, how are the other details explained? How does the Big Bang explain six days of creation? Or has the Big Bang never tried to do that? Well, this is a big topic. Vitali, let me recommend some books that can help you with this. And there are different perspectives on it, as you might imagine. While Genesis 1 is not Hebrew poetry, there's a poetic element to it. It's telling history in a poetic way. It's telling history in a rhythmic way.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

And God said on day one, day two, you know how it goes. And God said, and then He saw it was good. And then on day two, and He...In other words, there's a rhythm to it, and there's a congruence between the three, the first three days and the last three days. In fact, let me just call up the passage here, just so we're clear. Verse three says, And God said, let there be light. And there was light. And there was evening morning. I'm skipping ahead, the first day. And then the next, verse six, and God said, let the vault between the water separate the earth from the water. And it goes on to say, and there was morning, the second day. And then verse nine, and God said.

You can see there's a rhythm to it. In fact, even when you look at it in the text, there seems to be some sort of poetic way of telling a historical truth. But the main point, at least in verse one, is that the heavens and the earth were created. In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. Now, that first verse seems to imply that the heavens and the earth, which is supposed to mean the universe. There was no Hebrew word for universe. It's supposed to say that in the beginning, God just created the universe. And the very next verse, verse two says, and the earth was formless, and empty. Darkness over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waves.

We went in verse one, from in the beginning, God created the universe in verse two, God is now suddenly talking about the Earth. Did anything happen in between those two verses? We don't know. But we went from the entire universe in verse one to now we're talking about the Earth. So, some theologians will say, like John Lennox, he will say, well, the Bible leaves the age of the universe indeterminate because if you want to take a literal view of Genesis, the heavens and the earth, the universe is created long before you ever get to the days or at least before you ever get to the days. You don't know how far before.

Because you go from the universe in verse one to the earth in verse two. Now, we don't have time to go through all this here on this program. That's why I want to recommend some books. Probably 'Seven Days That Divide the World' by John Lennox is certainly a book to read. Of course, Hugh Ross has some books as well that can be helpful if you're interested in this. And let me also say this, that Genesis 1 is not describing the Big Bang as the Big Bang. It was a prescientific age. The text is consistent with the creation event we now know as the Big Bang. But it's not giving you a technical explanation of the Big Bang of that creation event. It's consistent with it. But it's not a scientific expose of it, or a description of it.

Remember, who is the text written to? Is the Bible written to you? The answer is no. The Bible, particularly Genesis 1, was written to the Israelites who had just left Egypt. It's written for you and for me, but it wasn't written to you or to me. And we need to know that when we look at the text, because it will help us discover what the text really means. And there are some scholars who point out that Genesis chapter one is probably a polemic against the Egyptian creation story. Why? Because it's written to people who just came out of Egypt. Look, when they're walking through the desert, they're not asking questions the rest of us might be asking, like, I

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

wonder how old this place is? Or I wonder if creation or evolution is true? Or I wonder if the all the questions we ask in the 21st century are not the questions they were asking.

What they're asking is, is Yahweh the true God or are the Egyptian gods the true God? And if you look at the Egyptian creation stories and you compare it to Genesis, you can make a pretty good case that Genesis is a polemic, meaning a corrective to the Egyptian creation story. Somehow, the Egyptian gods who are finite gods preexist. They don't explain where they came from. But these gods have to fight one another in order to bring order to chaos. Whereas in the Bible, in Genesis, God is not inside the universe. He's not one of many finite gods. He is outside the universe. He's the one true God and he doesn't have to fight anybody.

He just speaks and brings order to chaos. So, when you look at any text in the Bible, you want to ask yourself, who is this written to? It will help you discover how to interpret it properly in my view. If you don't ask that question, you might think oh, this is written to me. People classically make that mistake with Jeremiah 29:11. The famous passage, the plans I have for you. Plans to prosper you, plans to give you hope and a future. You know, this thing is written on birthday cards, it's stitched into pillows, it's on posters and people take it as if it's a promise to 21st century Christians.

Was that text written to 21st century Christians? No. It was written to the exiles that were taken forcibly out of Judah in 586 BC by the Babylonian dictator, Nebuchadnezzar, who dragged them off to modern day Iraq, (Babylon in that day). And God, through the prophet Jeremiah, is telling those exiles, I have plans for you. Plans to prosper you, plans to give you hope and a future. Seventy years from now, I'm going to bring you back into the land. And by the way, that's exactly what happened. In about 516 BC, they went back into the land 70 years later.

But this is not a promise to us. It was a promise to them. We learn from it. We learn that God is faithful, and that God took care of his people 2600 or so years ago. But it's not a promise directly to us. When people say I'm claiming Jeremiah 29:11. It's a promise to me. I say, why don't you claim Jeremiah 44:11 is if it's a promise to you? What does Jeremiah 44:11 say? Jeremiah 44:11 is what God promised to the exiles who went to Egypt in 586 BC. And God warned them, don't go to Egypt. You know what Jeremiah 44:11 says? It says, I will destroy you and all Judah. You don't see that stitched into a pillow. You don't see that on a birthday card. Happy birthday, I will destroy you and all of Judah. Oh, that is so sweet grandma. Thank you so much.

No, the reason that we make mistakes is because we take stuff out of context. We don't know who it's written to. The Bible is not a fortune book where you just open anywhere and point to a verse and go, I'm claiming this verse for me. I've never seen anybody claim Jeremiah 44:11. But they'll claim Jeremiah 29:11 all day because they're not interpreting the Bible properly. And so, we have to do the same thing in every passage, including Genesis 1. Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is not an issue to divide over. There are young earth Christians and old Earth Christians. And when people ask me, how old do you think the universe is, I always say I'm

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek      PODCAST

absolutely convinced it's at least 62 years old. All right, it's at least 86. I'll throw my mom in there.

I don't really care how old it is. To tell you the truth. I think the evidence is better that it's old. But it doesn't really matter to me. But when you look at the text, I think if you look at it carefully, I agree with John Lennox. The Bible leaves the age of the universe indeterminate. Could it teach a young universe? It could, but it could also leave it indeterminate. Because as I mentioned earlier, the first verse of the Bible has the universe created before you ever get to the days. By the way, this is another issue for inerrancy. Okay? What do you mean by inerrancy? How precise do you need to be? Is the Bible a scientific textbook? No. But when it teaches on science, it teaches accurately. But it doesn't teach in scientific precision.

In fact, there are even many scientific books that aren't as precise as they could be, like the number Pi. You know, it goes on forever, 3.14 whatever. No matter what number you put in there, someone could claim you're being imprecise. You didn't go all the way out. Well, you can't go all the way out. It goes on forever. How precise do you need to be to be inerrant? That's a philosophical question. The Bible is inerrant in whatever it teaches. It doesn't mean it's going to have extreme scientific precision, like, say, a document that NASA writes to put a rover on Mars. But when it says God created the heavens and the earth, it's telling the truth. He did. All right.

Now, if you want to ask a question, and we try and get to as many as we can, friends. Just email us at [Hello@CrossExamined.org](mailto:Hello@CrossExamined.org). So, today we covered questions on inerrancy, everything happens for a reason, rewards in heaven, Big Bang in Genesis. If you have other questions, email us at [Hello@CrossExamined.org](mailto:Hello@CrossExamined.org). Or if you see me out on the road, and you want to ask a question, we do quite a bit of that. Please know that I'm going to be, Lord willing, at Journey Fellowship Church this Sunday, the 24th of March. That's in Slidell, Louisiana, not far from New Orleans. Morning services and evening I'll be doing I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. We'll take your questions there in the evening, 6pm Central Time.

Next night, Southeastern Louisiana University, the 25th of March, 6pm Central time, so 7pm on the East Coast. That will be live streamed, Lord willing. And then I'll be at a community event, Grant Community Event, Grant, Michigan, that Thursday, the 28th of March. I think it starts at 6pm if I'm not mistaken. All the details are on our website. That's a half hour or so north of Grand Rapids. We'll be doing I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist taking your questions. Then on let's see, what do we got? Oh, yeah, University of Buffalo April 3, and then Calvary Chapel Star on Sunday morning. That's April 7. That's near Boise, Idaho, then Mountain Heights Calvary Chapel that night. Then the next night, Boise State University in Boise, Idaho at 7pm. I think that's Mountain Time. So it'd be 9pm on the East Coast. That will be live streamed, Lord willing.

And then we have other events coming up. We've got the Worldview Apologetics conference out in Seattle on the 20th of April. And then Antioch Bible Church out there near Seattle on the

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
.ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

21st in Kirkland. And then we have the Culture and Christianity conference on the 26th and 27th in Nashville, Tennessee, Fervent Church. It looks like in Las Vegas on the 28th of April. More coming up. We've got the Unshaken conference near Pittsburgh on the 18th of May and there's other events coming up in May I'll mention to you the next time. So, there's a lot going on ladies and gentlemen.

Also, we're about to announce, well, I think it may already have been posted. We're about to do Jesus Versus the Culture, the online course, which is something you're going to want to be a part of in this election year. We're going to talk about everything from socialism, to communism, to capitalism, to CRT, to cancel culture, to transgenderism, to how to find your true identity. We're talking about so many cultural issues. It's 23 hours of video. We're going to do it in two semesters. Spring semester starts in April. Fall semester starts in September. We're going to break it into two so go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Look for 'Jesus Versus the Culture.'

I'll be your instructor if you take the premium version. I think we'll have seven live Q&A Zoom sessions. Sign up for that and be salt and light this election year. It's going to be a difficult year, a lot of conflict. But you can make a difference by taking 'Jesus Versus the Culture. All right friends, it's been great being with you. Lord willing, this coming weekend, we're going to have Dinesh D'Souza on. We're going to talk about 'Police State,' his film. We're also going to talk about his book, 'What's So Great About Christianity?' So, tune in this coming weekend for that radio program and podcast. And Lord willing, we will see you here next week. God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**

