

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Why Objections Don't Defeat the Truth of God

(April 18, 2024)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, if there is a good God, why is there so much evil in the world? And if there is a good God who wants us to love us, or wants us to love Him and one another, why isn't He more overt? Why does He seem to be hidden? Those are two of the most powerful objections to Christianity. But I'm here to say that even if you can't answer those objections, that the evidence for God outweighs them greatly. We've talked about those issues before.

We've pointed out that evil doesn't disprove God. It actually shows God does exist because there would be no evil unless there was good, and there'd be no good unless God existed. And we've also talked about divine hiddenness. Why would God be less overt than we might want Him to? We've dealt with those issues on the program before. But even if you did not have any answers to those questions, I submit to you that Christianity, and certainly theism, would be true even if you couldn't answer those two main objections.

And I'm going to get into that later in the program. But I want to start with a couple of updates, ladies and gentlemen. A couple of weeks ago, I was on Dinesh D'Souza's program. We've had Dinesh on this program before, and we were talking about the Richard Dawkins situation. I'm sure some of you have seen that by now, that a couple of weeks ago a video of Dr. Dawkins speaking about Christianity went fairly viral.

And Dawkins was saying, actually he was saying something that he's been saying for about the past decade. And that is, is that he wants Christian values in a society overall. Maybe not every value, but he wants that over, say, the values of a Muslim society. And he sees over there in the UK that Islam continues to grow, largely, by the way, through procreation. They have many more children than Christians or secularists do.

So, they're out populating the Christians and the secularists. And Dawkins realizes this is a problem. So, he went on and on about how he loves Christmas, and he loves hymns, and how he says, well, I don't believe a word of it's true. But I'd much rather live in a Christian society

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

than say, a Muslim society. And he said, I need to choose my words carefully here. Now notice, ladies and gentlemen, that he is in the realm of morality, yet at the same time, he is the one that said there is no morality, there is no right or wrong, there is no justice.

There is no good or bad, just or unjust, good or evil. We just dance to our DNA, as he said, because he's a materialist. He thinks everything's made of molecules. But when you get right down to it, he also recognizes, because he's a human being, that there are things that are right and there are things that are wrong, even though he can't explain those things by his ideology, his ideology of materialism. This is why atheism is an insufficient worldview, because it can't explain what we all know to be true, that certain things are right and other things are wrong.

It can't explain several other things as well. We'll get into it a little bit later. But Dawkins is admitting that he wants Christian values, and he wants Christian morality. He doesn't want Muslim values or Muslim morality, even though he's an atheist. And my point on Dinesh's show was you can't expect Christian values to permeate a society or even to be a majority position in a society if you do not believe that Christianity is indeed true.

That would be like cutting flowers and expecting them to continue to bloom over and over again after you've cut them free from the root. Sure, you can bring flowers home that are freshly cut, and they'll bloom for a little while. They'll stay bloomed, but they're not going to rebloom because they have no foundation. They have no nourishment. You've cut them from their roots.

And if you cut Christianity's values from the roots, the truth of Christianity, eventually those values are going to be overcome by something else, something that people think is true, whether that's secularism, or Islam, or some other worldview. Now, think about this, ladies and gentlemen. I said this on Dinesh's show, that the only worldview that is going to secure the rights that we've become accustomed to in the West, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom in general.

The only worldview, equality, that's going to ensure that we have those rights, is the Christian worldview. The Muslim worldview isn't going to support human rights like that. The Muslim worldview will import and impose Sharia law on a society. Women are not going to have the

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

same status as men. There is not going to be religious freedom. You're not going to have the same freedom of speech. A Hindu society is not going to do that. They have a caste system. Certain people are more free or more privileged than others.

An atheistic society isn't going to do that because they don't have any grounding for these rights. And when you look at atheistic nations over the past century or so, they are the ones that have murdered the most people, because the state becomes God. If there's no God beyond, if there's no true God, if there's no God beyond human beings, then the state becomes God. And in order to create a utopia on earth, we're going to kill the people that get in our way from creating this utopia. That was Mao, that was Stalin, that was Pol Pot.

These are the people that murdered millions of their own citizens because atheism does not afford them a standard beyond themselves. They are the standard. So, there's not another worldview out there other than the Christian worldview that is going to give us the rights that we think are really rights. They're true, and they come from Christianity. This is why even people like Tom Holland, not the Spider man actor, the historian from the UK who wrote the book 'Dominion,' says although he was fascinated with Greece and Rome as a child, he realized that he didn't like the values of Greece and Rome.

He likes the values of Christianity, even though he's not a Christian. And this is what Dawkins is saying. This is what Douglas Murray, who identifies as a gay atheist, is saying. Although they don't think Christianity is true, they like the values of Christianity. They may disagree with some of them, obviously. If he's gay, he probably thinks that same-sex relations are fine. But the values of equality, the values of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, you get these things from Christianity.

You don't get them from ancient Rome. You don't get them from atheism. You don't get them from Hinduism. You don't get them from Islam. You get them from Christianity. Also, by the way, I want to mention that Dinesh's new endeavor called the Red Referral Network, we spoke about when he was on this program. RedReferralNetwork.com/CEO, will help you actually do business with people that share your values. We mentioned that when he was on the program. And if you sign up under RedReferralNetwork.com/CEO, a portion of your monthly membership will go to CrossExamined.org.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, check that out. That's redreferralnetwork.com/CEO. Why give your money to companies that are going to take that money and use that money, your money, to actually work against the values that you think are true and right? Why not do business with people who are conservatives and Christians rather than people who are going to take your money and use your money against you? Check it out. RedReferallNetwork.com/CEO.

All right, we're going to get into the heart of the program right after the break. What is this evidence that Christianity is true? 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 minutes.

If you're low on the FM dial looking for National Public Radio, go no further. We're actually going to tell you the truth here. You're never going to hear this on NPR. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio network. You know, there's been a controversy regarding National Public Radio. I'm sure you've seen it in the news, how they have all these liberal journalists, apparently. Was that a mystery? I didn't think it was a mystery.

People are saying, wow, this is a revelation. It's not a revelation. We always knew NPR was far, far left and the guy that blew the whistle on this has now been suspended, apparently by NPR, further fueling the controversy that they don't have anybody with a conservative point of view who does reporting for them. In fact, I think the Babylon Bee had a headline saying that the big surprise was that NPR has a journalist? Gee, we didn't know. [Laughter]

Anyway, another update I got to mention before we get into the heart of the program. A new study out of the Netherlands following 2700 kids over 11 to 15 years showed that 11% showed gender dysphoria in early adolescence being uncomfortable with their gender. So, 2700 kids, 11%. Let's just round it off. You know, one out of ten had this gender dysphoria. By the way, almost completely social media driven. Because a decade or so ago, it was one out of every 10,000, not one out of every ten.

And it was mostly men that thought they were women. Now we have women actually thinking they're men and it's social media driven. And we point all this out in the book, 'Correct, Not Politically Correct: About Same-Sex Marriage and Transgenderism', the brand-new update. And

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

this update in the news, this study from the Netherlands just came out. So, I don't have that in the book, but it confirms what I said in the book. And here it's actually updating what I said in the book, but it's confirming it. It's just updating the stats.

Here's what the study said. Although 11% showed gender dysphoria between eleven and 15 years. It says this, by age 26, the majority of them, the vast majority of them, had outgrown the issue. Only 4% of those experiencing dysphoria at age eleven still had issues with their gender at age 26, 4%. Now, I said in the book, based on the study at the time, that about 80% of the kids that had so-called gender dysphoria, had grown out of it by the time they're 18.

This updates it and says by the time they're 26, only 4% of those 11% had issues with gender dysphoria. Do you see the point here? Virtually nobody, by the time they hit 26 or a very small number, has gender dysphoria. In other words, people grow out of it. This is why it's a lie for people to say the only solution to gender dysphoria as a kid is puberty blockers, then cross-sex hormones, then, God forbid, surgery. This problem nearly always fixes itself. It makes zero sense to try and fix this problem medically when it's not a medical problem. It's a mental problem.

And everybody knows this, but too few people are willing to say the truth. We need to start saying the truth because we love people, ladies and gentlemen. Because we don't want them to get treatments that are not going to work, are going to be harmful, and are unnecessary because they're going to grow out of it anyway. Anyway, check out the book, 'Correct, Not Politically Correct: About Same-Sex Marriage and Transgenderism.' And if you want the article from which I just took those stats, we will put them in the show notes.

So, check all that out. Now, let me get to the heart of the program today. And we talked at the top of this divine hiddenness evil issue, and we said there are answers to those problems. But my point is, is that even if you didn't have answers to those problems, you would still be able to conclude that theism and Christian theism is indeed true because the evidence just overwhelms these objections. In other words, maybe I could put it this way. Don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know. Let me say that again. Don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Yeah, you might not be able to figure out why God allowed a particular evil, but that doesn't take away from what you do know. Yeah, you might not be able to figure out why God wasn't more overt than you'd like Him to be. But that doesn't or shouldn't cause you to doubt what you do know. For example, you do know, because the evidence shows this, that even atheists are admitting that the universe exploded into being out of nothing.

Once there was no space, no matter, no time, or no space, time, and matter. And then this space, time continuum leapt into existence out of nothing. And it seems, just based on what we know from what even atheists are saying, that if space, time, and matter did have a beginning, as everyone seems to admit, what could have caused that? Well, the atheists don't know. They don't think it's God. But again, if space, time, and matter had a beginning, it would seem that only a cause outside of space, time, and matter could have caused that.

In other words, the cause must be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful to create the universe out of nothing, personal in order to choose to create, and intelligent to have a mind to make a choice to create. Now, when you think about a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent cause, who do you think of? A being like God, obviously. Now, you don't know if it's the Christian God at this point. You'd have to discover whether or not Jesus rose from the dead to say it was the Christian God.

But if Jesus really did rise from the dead, then we can say that the same being that walked out of the tomb 1,991 years ago is the same being in whose divine nature created the universe out of nothing. Now look, even when I was growing up, I grew up going to Catholic church because I'm from New Jersey and it's the law. You're either Catholic or Jewish if you're from New Jersey. But I didn't know who Jesus was growing up. But I always knew there had to be a first cause, there had to be a Creator. Because when there's a creation, you know there's a Creator. When there's design, you know there's a designer.

When there's a moral law written on your heart, you know there must be a moral lawgiver. Those things are true even if you can't answer every issue related to evil, even if you can't have a firm answer on why God isn't more overt. You know those things are, are true beyond any of these other doubts. In fact, it was Louise Antony in a debate with Dr. William Lane Craig many years ago. Louise Anthony, an atheist, said this, and I'm paraphrasing.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

We have this in the book, 'Stealing from God: Why Atheists Need God to Make Their Case.' Actually, let me look it up, because I know we have it in the book. Louise Anthony admitted something that actually hurt her position when it came to atheism. She's trying to affirm atheism. And here's what she said in the debate, actually. She said, and I'm reading from page 114 of 'Stealing from God.' She said, any argument for moral skepticism will be based upon premises which are less obvious than the existence of objective moral values themselves, unquote.

And I go on to say, indeed, objective moral rights are self-evident. Atheism is not. Or let me translate that in everyday language. You know with more certainty that murder is wrong than you know that atheism is true. So, why would you ever say that atheism is true? In fact, in the debate I had with David Silverman, who at the time was the president of the American Atheists. He's Jewish by ethnicity, but he's an atheist. And I kept pressing him in the debate.

David, if you're an atheist, if there is no God, you can't say the Holocaust was wrong. And he tried to avoid that, but I kept pressing it on him. And finally, he admitted, he said, you know, Frank, you're right. The Holocaust wasn't really wrong. He said this despite the fact he's Jewish and he's an atheist. And I essentially said to him, I said, David. If your worldview is telling you that the Holocaust wasn't really wrong, you have the wrong worldview.

You know with more certainty the Holocaust was wrong than you know that atheism's true. So, why would you ever be an atheist? Welcome to theism. Again, don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know. You know beyond any doubt, murder's wrong. You know that the universe had a beginning. You know that it's fine-tuned to extreme precision, which is crying out for an intelligent explanation. This universe is a fix in the sense that somebody fixed the laws of nature and so many aspects of our physical universe in such a way that if they were any different, we wouldn't exist.

One illustration I like to give regarding the strong or the gravitational force compared to the strong nuclear force, that that's fine-tuned to one in ten to the 40th precision. What's one in ten to the 40th precision? That's one part in one with 40 zeros following it. You say, Frank, I can't get my head around that number. Well, let me give you a couple of illustrations. First of all, one in ten to the 40, as I say, is one with 40 zeros following it. That number is ten times

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

bigger than one in ten to the 39, because you're adding a zero. There's only been ten to the 17 seconds since the earth had life on it according to the old Earth dating. That would be 4 billion years.

That's ten to the 17 seconds. We're talking one in ten to the 40. That's trillions of times bigger than the number of seconds since life began on Earth. And here's the illustration to show you how precise one in ten to the 40's is. Take the entire North American continent from Central America all the way to Greenland and stack it in dimes all the way to the moon. That's 238,000 miles in dimes. Then do that on a billion other North American continents. Stack all those continents in dimes all the way to the moon, 238,000 miles.

Then take all those dimes, put them in one unbelievably huge pile. Mark one dime red, mix it in, blindfold a friend, throw them on the pile, ask him to pick one dime at random. The chance he would pick that one red dime is one chance in ten to the 40th power. Is he going to pick that dime? Of course not. That's the kind of precision just one ratio in our physical universe exhibits. That's one out of dozens. You know a mind was behind that. That was either designed or it wasn't. It's obviously design.

You know that with more certainty than you know, or that should cause you to question that God exists because of evil, or divine hiddenness, or any one of a number of other objections you can come up with. Much more after the break. Don't go anywhere. Back in two. Welcome back to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio network, website CrossExamined.org. By the way, I got an email from Mike, who writes in quite frequently, and I'll get back to our original topic here in a minute.

But I want to deal with something that Mike brought up because it has to do with the previous program. We had James Lindsay on a couple of shows ago talking about Marxism, and wokism, and CRT. You need to go back and listen to those programs because James is amazing in those areas. And people go, well, you know, James Lindsay is not a Christian. Well, he's becoming one it seems. He was an atheist. He's moved to agnosticism, and he has so many Christian friends now, including me, and Charlie Kirk, and many others.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And he's starting to see, I think, he's starting to see the truth of Christianity. But just pray for James. He's a great treasure in terms of what he knows about these issues and his New Discourses podcast. If you listen to it, you're going to learn a lot. Anyway, we talked a lot about this and Marxism on the programs that we had with him, as I say, a couple of shows ago. And Mike wrote in, and he said, just a brief follow up on my comments about the misplaced fear of Marxism and socialism.

And he says, here's the Marxist economic philosophy in a nutshell, from each according to his ability, to each according to his need. And then he goes to the acts of the apostles in the book of Acts. And Mike says, to each according to his needs. And they were selling their possessions, and belongings, and distributing the proceeds to all as they had need. All the believers were of one heart and mind. No one claimed any of their possessions was their own. But they shared everything they had.

Mike said, I'm not seeing much of a difference in these philosophies, except one was practiced by Jesus's apostles and early followers. And one was promoted by an atheist who claimed religion was the opium of the people. Perhaps the Apostles believed it was in accordance with Jesus's teaching, or perhaps it was a way to attract others to become believers. He says, I don't know or care about the answers to these questions because I believe in capitalism, properly regulated in the right to private property, and I believe the extreme majority of Americans believe the same.

Okay, thanks, Mike. Yeah, insights there. Well, we cover all this in the course, 'Jesus vs. the Culture.' We have two or three of the 23 one hour sessions, lessons on economics. And let me just address Mike's point, because it's often brought up that, wow, weren't they socialists in the early church? Based on what you could read about, as Mike just said, in Acts chapter four, particularly verses 32-35. And here's the response.

We unpack it much more in 'Jesus vs. the Culture.' And you want to be part of the course. You can still sign up in the premium version because the first Zoom is this Tuesday the 23rd. A Zoom is a Q&A session where I come on live and we learn from one another. You can ask any question you want. We interact. So, if you want to be a part of the premium version, you can still sign up. If you want to take the self-paced, you can take it whenever you want.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And this is a good time to take this course in an election year, because all these issues are going to come up, issues that we cover in 'Jesus vs. the Culture.' But to Mike's point, Mike seems to be saying, well, you know, don't they practice this in Acts chapter four? First of all, what you need to remember is that Acts is mostly a description, not a prescription. Acts are the activities, the book of the activities. Now, there are things in the book of Acts that might be prescriptive.

For example, when they give certain speeches, it might be to exhort people to do certain things, exhort Christians to do certain things. But most of what Acts is, is a description of how the Church began and grew for the first 30 years of its existence, from about 33 AD to about 62 AD. Secondly, the Bible presupposes private property. Thou shall not steal presupposes private property. So, socialism is not condoned by the Bible. They may have practiced charity in the Bible, but not socialism.

Also, if you read this section, you know how Annas and Sapphira were struck dead. Why were they struck dead? Or Ananias and Sapphira. They were struck dead for lying, not for withholding private property. Also, if you notice, in this case, the government was not involved. Sharing was voluntary. Socialism is a system where the government owns all the property. That was not the case here. The individuals had the property. They just shared it.

So, this is not a prescription for government socialism. This is a description in Acts chapter four of how certain people shared early on, any unique event that is never commanded to be the norm elsewhere. I mean, we are commanded to share. In fact, that's what Paul says in 1 Timothy 6. He says, command those who are rich in this present world not to be arrogant, nor to put their hope in wealth, which is so uncertain, but to put their hope in God, who richly provides us everything for our enjoyment.

So, God is saying here through Paul, that God does give everything for our enjoyment, but we're to share what he gives us. And he goes on to say, Paul does, command them to do good, to be rich in good deeds, and to be generous and willing to share. In this way, they will lay up treasure for themselves as a firm foundation for the coming age so that they may take hold of the life that is truly life, unquote.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

That's 1 Timothy, chapter six, ladies and gentlemen. And of course, as you know, Jesus says in Luke chapter 16, to use your worldly wealth, use your money to win people to Christ, because then you will be welcomed into everlasting habitations. You'll be welcomed essentially into heaven because you used your money to win people to Christ. And by the way, thank you for those that donate to CrossExamined.org. We take your donations very seriously. We're very frugal with the donations you give us.

We try and maximize what you give us to reach people for Christ, to grow them in Christ, to make disciples, to go into the lion's den, mostly college campuses, and show people the evidence that Christianity is true and to answer their questions. By the way, we've been to three campuses in the past couple of weeks. They're all up on our YouTube channel. Just click on live when you go to the Cross Examined YouTube channel, two words, cross examined. You'll see one at Southeastern Louisiana University.

You'll see another session at the University of Buffalo and the one last week we did at Boise State. We had an hour and a half of questions at Boise State. It kept going. We had an hour and a half at Buffalo. Actually, I'm getting them confused now. We had a lot of questions at both of those events. Actually, at all three. You can see all the Q&A because the entire presentation plus the Q&A is all streamed. So, it's up on our website if you want to go further. In any event, I wanted to bring that up, that socialism is not condoned by the Scriptures.

Socialism is a government system. And when people share in the Scriptures, it's not the government. It's them just in a unique situation, pooling their resources there in order to launch the early Church. And private property is presupposed in the Scriptures. I also want to mention the 'Reasons for Faith' course that's coming up with the great Stephen C. Meyer. This is a unique course, all done live via Zoom. You're going to want to be a part of it. It ends, or I should say it begins at the end of this month, April. Go to CrossExamined.org. Click on online courses, you'll see it there. A unique opportunity to be with the great Steven C. Meyer.

Many of the sessions he'll be broadcasting from Cambridge. He's over in Cambridge and he's going to be teaching this course for the first time. And then he's going to teach it a second time live in Cambridge with about 40 students who have been invited from around the world. So, if you take it at CrossExamined.org, you'll actually get the course before they do. So, check that

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

out. By the way, this weekend I'll be at Seattle at a Worldview Apologetics course, and then I'll be speaking at Antioch Bible Church on Sunday. That's this weekend, the 20th and 21st, I think. Let me get the dates here. Yes, the Worldview Apologetics conference, which will be at Crossroads Bible Church in Bellevue, Washington, and then Antioch Bible Church on Sunday the 21st.

Next weekend I'll be out with my friend Alan Jackson, not the singer, but the pastor out there in Murfreesboro World Outreach church, and many other speakers will be there as well. That's the 26th and 27th out near Nashville. Check all that out. And don't forget about the Unshaken conference with me, Natasha Crain, and Alisa Childers out near Pittsburgh, Saturday, May 18. Check all that out. All right, let me go back to our topic for the day, and that is the fact that you should not let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know.

Just because there are things we can't explain, that doesn't mean you should doubt the things we can explain. Yes, there's a creator to the universe. Yes, there's a fine tuner to the universe. Yes, there's a moral law giver, God's nature, which shows us that, say, murder is evil, and love is good. You know those things. And not nothing with regard to evil or divine hiddenness should cause you to doubt those things you do know. You also know, for example, that you have a mental life that you can think. And if atheism were true, there's no reason to think you could think.

Because if you're just a molecular machine, if you're just a moist robot, if everything you think, and everything you feel, and everything you do is completely caused by the laws of physics operating on molecules bumping around in your brain, then you should not believe anything you think because you're not really reasoning. You're just reacting. But you can think. In fact, you can use your mind to discover what's true outside your skull. Why can you do that? On atheism, there's no explanation.

On theism there is because your mind is made in the image of the great mind, which was meant for you to try and discover truths about the world and the truths about the great mind, God. You're here to know God and to make him known. And so, even the idea of having a debate with an atheist presupposes you have a free mind to follow the truth where it leads. When in fact, materialistic atheism, which is the dominant worldview for atheists today, makes reason

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

itself impossible. If reason is impossible, how can we debate? What are we debating? You see, Christianity, or more broadly, theism, can explain these things. Atheism can't.

Don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know. Much more after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with me, Frank Turek on the great American Family Radio network, 180 or so stations strong around the country. We're back in two minutes. Ladies and gentlemen, Frank Turek, with you from I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist.

If you're listening on the American Family Radio network, this is also a podcast, and we have a midweek podcast that comes out on Tuesday, which is not broadcast on the American Family Radio network. If you want to listen to that, I hope you do. Just search for the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast, and you'll find it. Now, I'm reading a book right now called 'What's Eating the Universe? And Other Cosmic Questions' by Dr. Paul Davies.

Dr. Davies is not a Christian, but he writes a very good book. And he's a theoretical physicist, according to his bio at Arizona State University. It says Davies has worked for much of his career in astrophysics and cosmology, with emphasis on the origin and early stages of the universe, the quantum properties of black holes, and the nature of time. He's interested in the nature and origin of life, including extraterrestrial life beyond the Earth and in complex systems generally.

And here's what Davies writes in the book, 'What's Eating the Universe?' Talking about mathematics, he says, for a start, there is no absolute reason for nature to have a straightforward mathematical subtext in the first place. And even if it does, there is no reason why humans should be capable of comprehending it.

You couldn't tell from daily experience that the disparate physical systems making up the natural world are linked deep down by a network of coded mathematical relationships. How has this come about? How have human beings become privy to nature's subtle and elegant scheme? Somehow, the universe has engineered not just its own awareness, but its own comprehension.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Mindless, blundering atoms have conspired to spawn beings who are not merely capable to watch the show, but to unravel the plot, to engage with the totality of the cosmos, and the silent mathematical tune to which it dances, unquote. Do you see his point? He's basically saying, why, first of all, is the universe describable in mathematics? Why are all the theories of science that have been confirmed elegant in the way they are described mathematically and the way they interact?

And why can we as human beings comprehend this? He goes on to say this. Some years ago, I committed these deliberations to an article in the New York Times. The editor chose the byline quote, 'Having Faith in Science.' This was a fabulous article, by the way, ladies and gentlemen. And I quote it at length in the book 'Stealing from God,' because, as Davy says here, he got a lot of heat for saying that theists basically assumed God exists. And atheists basically assumed the laws of nature just exist.

Now, I think we give evidence that God exists, and I also think we give evidence that God is behind the laws of nature, because laws come from lawgivers. But let me leave that aside for a second. Davies goes on to say this. Again, this is from the book, 'What's Eating the Universe?' He says, this story, or this article he wrote in the New York Times called 'Having Faith in Science', he says it provoked a furious backlash from some of my peers who counsel against anything that blurs the boundary of science and religion, even on topics where their agendas overlap, and even though the word faith has many shades of meaning.

He says one of the more polite responses came from the renowned cosmologist and writer, Sean Carroll. Sean Carroll, as you may know, is an atheist. He debated William Lane Craig a number of years ago. In any event, Sean Carroll, he goes on to say, who expressed the consensus on the dependability of the laws of nature in characteristically eloquent fashion. Here's what Sean Carroll said. "There is a chain of explanations concerning things that happen in the universe which ultimately reaches the fundamental laws of nature and stops. At the end of the day, the laws are what they are. That's okay.

I'm happy to take the universe just as we find it." That's what Sean Carroll said and what Davies said in response to that. "Every scientist who opts to work on profound cosmic questions is confronted by this stark choice. Either, like Carroll, the universe for what it is, an inexplicable

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

brute fact, we take it like that, and we get on with the practical job of doing science or accept that the scientific enterprise rests on a deeper layer of rational order." A deeper layer of rational order. You see, atheists just take the laws of nature as a brute fact. They take the universe as a brute fact. It just happens to be here.

They can't explain why, whereas theists say, oh, no, we can explain why. Because we believe every effect has a cause. You see, if you're a theist, you're actually being more scientific than the atheistic scientists who dominate our universities. We have a reason. We're following every effect back to its cause. The atheistic materialists are cutting off explanation by saying, look, this stuff just exists. Stop asking questions. Stop asking where the laws come from. Stop asking why mathematics describes the universe so well.

Stop asking the question of how can I even know what the universe is about by using the laws of mathematics, and using my own mind, and my own free will? Stop asking those questions because they are interfering with our ideology of materialism. Which, by the way, the ideology of materialism has made reason itself impossible. Because, again, if you're just a molecular machine, why should you believe anything you think? You should say this.

I know I'm not a molecular machine because I can follow the evidence where it leads. I can think. That's an effect. How do I explain that effect? I can't explain it by just molecules bumping into one another. The best explanation points back to the same God, the same being. You don't have to call it God, but some intelligent force out there. This is not a God of the gaps argument, ladies and gentlemen. We're not arguing from what we don't know. We're arguing from what we do know. In fact, you can't have a God of the gaps argument if you're claiming that natural laws could have caused this.

Because what we're saying is natural laws themselves need a cause. That's what we're saying. Nature isn't all there is. We're reasoning from effect. Nature itself, the creation, the design, the ability of mathematics to describe the universe, the laws of mathematics themselves, the laws of logic themselves, our ability to understand those laws, and our sense perception that allows us to discover what's true about the universe outside our skull and then describe it in mathematical terms.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

We're saying all those are effects, and they need to be explained by a cause. And the attributes of that cause fall right out of the data. Again, the cause, if space, time, and matter had a beginning, have to be spaceless. The cause has to be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, and intelligent. And it also has to be intelligent if the universe is described so well by mathematics, and it is. And we have a mind that can understand the universe in the language of mathematics. And there are these mathematical laws, and these logical laws, and by the way, also these moral laws.

All of those effects are best explained by a being who has these eternal, immaterial attributes: spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent, moral, reasonable, logic. C.S. Lewis said it best. In fact, we've said this on this program before, but this quote is worth repeating. Here's what Lewis said. Suppose there were no intelligence behind the universe. In that case, nobody designed my brain for the purpose of thinking. Thought is merely the byproduct of some atoms within my skull. But if so, how can I trust my own thinking to be true?

But if I can't trust my own thinking, of course I can't trust the arguments leading to atheism and therefore have no reason to be an atheist or anything else. Unless I believe in God, I can't believe in thought. So, I can never use thought to disbelieve in God. Boom. You can't say it better than that. The atheists are using what God has provided to them to try and say God doesn't exist. They're stealing from God while they're arguing against Him.

That's why the book's called 'Stealing from God.' Because these attributes of our universe, of reality, wouldn't exist in the absence of God. There wouldn't be any material, because material had a beginning, and material is composed. There wouldn't be the laws of mathematics or the laws of logic. There wouldn't be a fine-tuned universe. There wouldn't be moral laws. We wouldn't have minds, not just brains. These things wouldn't exist. Nothing would exist if there was no God.

In fact, if there is no God, why does anything exist? Or if there is no God, why is there something rather than nothing, as Leibniz put it? The best explanation is there is a God. Now, again, this doesn't need to be the Christian God. It just turns out to be the Christian God after you discover Jesus predicted and accomplished His own resurrection from the dead. So, ladies and gentlemen, let me repeat the theme of the program.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know. Don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know. You do know all of the different effects we've been talking about today, the universe, the fine-tuning of the universe, moral laws, mathematical laws, logical laws, the fact that you have a mind, you do know all those things beyond a reasonable doubt.

So, don't let what you don't know about evil or divine hiddenness cause you to doubt what you do know. All right, folks, great being with you. Lord willing, we will see you in the midweek podcast, then. God bless.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

