

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

3 BIG Questions About Homosexuality, Human Flourishing, and Hell

(December 10, 2024)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, today we're going to go through some of the questions you have emailed to us at hello@crossexamined.org. I apologize. We can't get to all the questions, but we try to get to as many as possible. And we're going to try and get to three big questions today. One has to do with homosexuality. Another one has to do with the moral law, and can human flourishing just explain morality without God? And also, there's a question about why would God create people He knew they would go to hell.

But there's a spin on it. It's a little bit different question than the normal question regarding that. Let's start with a question that I get from Colin. Colin writes in I'm in college. I have a question regarding sin and how to interact with non-believers and sin. Recently at work I was part of a discussion where my co-workers were discussing homosexuality and their views on it. They were saying how it is good and all that. Let me stop right here.

Whenever somebody claims something is good, what should be your question to them? Yes, exactly. By what standard are you saying it's good? Anyway. He says they were saying how good it is and all that, and I was not sure exactly how to approach the situation. On one hand, I know that homosexuality is a sin from what the Bible tells us. On the other hand, as an American, I feel like it's none of my business what people do in their private lives. Let me stop right here.

That's a moral position as well. You can see when he says I feel like it's none of my business, as if it would be immoral to be concerned about what people do in their private lives. Is that correct? By what moral standard is it correct? And how do you know that what people do in their private lives won't affect other people?

And even if it doesn't affect other people, should we be concerned about what people do at their private lives, even if it's just hurting them? That's a question. Anyway, Colin goes on to say, it is easy to justify confronting non-believers about certain sins because through logic you can see that they are bad.

CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

For example, it's easy to see that murder is evil because it kills another person. All right, let me stop right here again. That's assuming that killing other people, murdering other people is bad. Now, we all know it's bad, but the question is, why is it bad if there is no God? Who said? I'll unpack that further in a minute. He says, but what about homosexuality? I feel like the only way to say it is wrong is because God says so. Is that enough? All right. Let me stop right here again.

Well, if there is no God, you can't say anything's right or wrong, at least not objectively. It's just your opinion. So, in a certain sense, we have to say, well, God says so is the ultimate reason. But He says so, not because He's arbitrary. He just decides, well, this is wrong, and this is right because His nature is what we mean by good. In fact, whatever we call God, I think just about everybody would agree whatever we call God, what we mean by God is the standard of goodness, righteousness, justice.

And of course that's what the Christians claim God is like. But the point here is, is that to say something is wrong, unless there's a standard beyond us, we can only say it's wrong in our opinion. It's not really wrong in an objective way. And we'll unpack that further here in a minute. He says, how do we go about confrontations regarding sins that are not obviously wrong?

Hopefully this question makes sense. I'm so grateful for your ministry and all you guys do. Thank you for all the resources you guys have available. Well, thank you so much, Colin. By the way, we have many resources CrossExamined.org. That's our website, CrossExamined with a D on the end of it, .org.

Of course, we have a YouTube channel, we have an Instagram page, TikTok, the whole deal, Facebook, Twitter, X. You can check us all out there. But also want to mention this podcast and our TV program, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, which you can see streaming on our website at 9 PM Eastern Time on Wednesdays.

It's also on the National Religious Broadcasters Network, which is on DirecTV channel 378. It's also on Roku. You can see it there. We also have online courses, as you know. Go to CrossExamined.org, click on online courses. You can see all those courses that we're doing. And

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

so, Colin is right. We do have a lot of resources out there. But let's go back to the question. The question is how do we know homosexuality is wrong apart from what the Bible says? Well, first of all, I would ask the people who are saying homosexuality is a good thing, by what standard are they saying that homosexual behavior is a good thing? Why?

Why do they think that is? Well, it's all about love they might say. Well, why is love a good thing? And what does love mean? Does love mean that you give whatever another person wants all the time? Is that really what love means? Or does love mean you seek what's best for the other person according to what God wants for the other person? Because if it's just what's best for the other person according to his or her own definition of best, well, that's just a subjective opinion.

And they might not really even know what's best for them. And of course, that's true with children, right? We don't just say to a kid, well, you think it's best that you eat M&M's for dinner. Okay, I guess that's good. It's bad. No, you might not have enough information to know really what's best for you. In fact, if you think back in your own life, you may have thought that a certain relationship was best for you and you prayed that relationship would work out, or a certain job was right for you, or a certain house, or a certain car, or even a certain friendship, whatever it is, you thought all these were great for you.

Maybe you thought a certain drug was great for you. You may have thought a lot of things were great and best for you. And in retrospect, you go, no. They really weren't. A) We don't always know what the truth is. B) Sometimes we suppress it. C) Sometimes we're just so immature that we think something is good for us when it really isn't.

So, we don't always know what's good for us. And good implies a standard, a best standard, a standard we ought to approach. And this is why, as we've talked about before, without purpose, objective purpose, you can't justify why any behavior is good or bad, right or wrong.

Just like if you don't know the purpose of a football game, you can't say that your quarterback throwing a touchdown is better than your quarterback throwing a pick six. That's when he throws it to the other team, and they take it back for a touchdown. Unless you know the purpose of the game, you can't say this is a good play and this is a bad play.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Likewise, unless you know the purpose of life, you can't say this is a good way to live life and this is a bad way to live life. You can only say the ways that you're living are different. You can't say one is objectively better than another if you don't have an overall goal, an overall purpose to life.

And there can't be an objective overall purpose to life unless God exists. Otherwise, it's just your opinion, just your opinion against, say, Hitler's opinion. His purpose was to wipe out the Jews, the homosexuals, the gypsies, and the Jehovah's Witnesses. Why is he wrong if there is no God? Well, because he's stifling human flourishing. I'll get to that in the next question.

But that, of course, presupposes human flourishing is a good thing. Why is that the case? Now, if God exists and if the Christian revelation is true, and I think it is, we've been through that on this program several times before, then the purpose of life, at least the purpose of sex, one purpose of sex is to be fruitful.

In fact, God's first command to us was to be fruitful and multiply. That's His very first command to human beings, is to basically have sex within the marriage of a man and a woman, to be fruitful and multiply. That's the first command. Now, just from a pragmatic perspective, homosexuality cannot obey the first command. You can't be fruitful in a homosexual relationship. Isn't it interesting, ladies and gentlemen, when you think about this, the homosexual movement, the LGBTQ movement, has adopted the rainbow as their symbol.

Well, where did that come from? Well, the rainbow is actually the symbol that God gave to Noah to say he wouldn't wipe out the world again through a great flood. That's interesting, because when you think about it, Noah had to bring two of every kind, male and female, on the ark, and it had to be male and female. Why? Because if it wasn't male and female, this little experiment was doomed to fail. You need male and female in order to propagate the species and, of course, from a human perspective, propagate civilization.

If everyone lived in a homosexual relationship, civilization would end quite quickly. So, it's interesting they adopt the rainbow symbol when in fact the rainbow symbol was supposed to be a symbol of life, yet they can't procreate life, or you can't procreate life through a same-sex

CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

relationship. So, we're to be fruitful and multiply, and we're to love God and love our neighbor. In homosexuality, you can't be fruitful.

Also, you know, Gary Thomas, a number of years ago wrote a book called 'Sacred Marriage'. He's a Christian writing a book about marriage. And I think the subtitle of the book was worth the price of the book. I think the subtitle I'm paraphrasing it, but it went something like this. What if marriage was made more for our holiness than our happiness? Think about that. My wife can call me a sanctification machine. Why? Because I stress her out sometimes and she has to adapt to be more like Jesus to put up with me.

And frankly, I have to do the same with her. And that's what opposite relationships do. The male has to, in a certain sense, subordinate his more physical desires to the wife's more emotional desires and vice versa. In a homosexual relationship, you don't have to do that. I'm not going to get too graphic here. This is a family show. But as you know, two men want to do the same thing. They have physical desires, and two women put intense emotional demands on one another.

So, instead of actually having to adapt to become less selfish to a certain extent in a same-sex relationship, ships, you don't have to adapt because you're trying to give the other person exactly what you want and that doesn't require you to sacrifice much. Now, of course, this may not resonate with people who are not Christians because we think the purpose of life is to become holy, more like Jesus.

And someone outside the Christian faith may say, well, that's not my purpose to life. Of course, maybe it's not your purpose to life, but your purpose is just subjective. If God exists, if Jesus is the savior, the Christian way of life to become more like Jesus is objective. And it's true if Christianity is true. And when it comes to a marriage relationship from a governmental perspective, leaving Christianity out of it, what is the purpose that the government has been involved in recognizing and putting rules around marriage?

Why is the government involved in marriage at all? To recognize the romantic affinity between two individuals? No, the reason for millennia, until about the past 10 minutes, the government was involved in recognizing marriage, which a bond between a man and a woman is to, from a

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

government perspective, to perpetuate and stabilize society. That's why the government was involved in marriage. Of course, it had religious overtones to it as well, but it's based in the natural design of the man and the woman, the natural law.

And only a man and a woman coming together can procreate and nurture the next generation. That's the purpose of marriage, from a government perspective, to perpetuate and stabilize society, to bring forth the next generation. Yes, we know some marriages don't bring forth children, but that's the exception rather than the rule. And the only relationship that can biologically procreate and provide a mother and a father to children is a man and a woman coming together to do so.

That's the main reason the government has been involved in marriage. It's not involved in recognizing love between two people. I mean, you love a lot of people in your life that aren't your spouse. But the government doesn't come in and say, okay, let's create some sort of legal recognition for that. You might love your tennis partner, but there's not going to be a, a tennis partner marriage that the government's going to recognize. You may love just a buddy or a friend of yours, but they're not going to... The government's not going to come in and somehow sanction and authenticate that relationship through some kind of legal recognition.

The reason we do it for marriage, and have done it for millennia, is to perpetuate and stabilize society. And sorry, a same-sex relationship can't do that. That may be politically incorrect to say, but I'm not here to be politically correct. I'm here to be correct because sorry, that's just the way it is. It's not bigotry, it's biology. And so, to say that these relationships are good is presupposing a standard of good that many people who are putting forth this argument don't have.

It ignores the fact that marriage is between a man and a woman, to perpetuate and stabilize society. And that's critical, why? Because marriage is set up as an institution not just to protect two people inside that institution, the man and the woman, but the children that come from that relationship. And if marriage then becomes all about just the romantic affinity of adults, the romantic desires of adults, then children are left out in the cold. And that's what our no fault divorce laws have done. They've made it easy to dissolve a relationship and leave children out in the cold.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

That's a disaster. It's a disaster for the children and it's also a disaster for civilization. If you've noticed, once our marriage laws became more liberal in that regard and you could break up a relationship just on a whim, and there was these no fault divorce laws, you could go out and commit adultery. Let me put it another way. Your spouse could go out and commit adultery, be completely guilty, and yet you have to divide the property with that person 50% because it's no fault. That has been a disaster. Our society morally has taken quite a hit since that occurred about 50 or so years ago.

And just to show you where you are not politically biased here, the first governor to do that was Ronald Reagan of California. He later regretted it, but he's the one that first signed the no fault divorce laws that spread across state to state. And now you can get a divorce easier than you can break up a business partnership. You can just walk out.

In fact, the contract really has no teeth to it. If you want out, you can get out. It rewards the person wanting to break the contract. In any event, if you want the details as to other reasons why same-sex relationships are not what we would call good even from a natural law perspective, even from a health perspective, get the book 'Correct, Not Politically Correct'.

The new version is called, the subtitle is 'About Same-Sex Marriage and Transgenderism'. Just came out last year. Colin, it's not a long read. I've covered all this in the book. When you look at the medical data regarding homosexuality, it's not a healthy lifestyle. Anywhere between it reduces lifespan anywhere between 8 and 20 years for male homosexuality. And lesbians have a very difficult or I should say a very negative health record for whatever reason.

It's not always known, but they do. So, you can check that out if you're looking for more of a medical case to point out. There are there are problems with homosexual relationships just from a medical case.

But the question of course that your friends have brought up just presupposes all sorts of moral standards and they probably don't have a moral standard outside of themselves by which they can say that yes, this is really the right moral position to have. If they do try and say it, they're

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

stealing from the Christian worldview to begin with because to say that all people ought to be treated equally and that this is all about love presupposes those are good things.

And that comes from the Christian worldview. Equality and love come from the Christian worldview. They just have different definitions that what people think about. It turns out, as I point out, in 'Correct, Not Politically Correct', everybody already has equal rights regardless of what the marriage laws are. Everyone has the equal right to marry a qualified person of the opposite sex. Some people who don't have an affinity for the opposite sex have not chosen to use that right. But that right is available to them just like anybody else.

So, there's nobody that's ever been denied equal marriage rights. What people have been denied is changing the meaning of marriage in order to accommodate whatever they want a marriage to be. And that has now been imposed on us by the United States Supreme Court, not a vote of the people, not even lined up with natural law. So, nobody's been denied equal rights. I mean, you could... Once you take away the man woman requirement, which is based on two, because you need a man and a woman to procreate, all bets are off as to what marriage could be called in the future.

In the future, you could probably marry a horse. You could marry 10 people. You could marry people who are biologically related to you. You could marry your daughter. You can. People go, oh, no, that'd be awful. Why? According to what standard? Who said? Your standard? Whatever you just decide is right? That's not an objective standard that we're all obligated to obey. You're only obligated to obey a standard of goodness and righteousness beyond yourself, and you're only obligated to a person.

So, the ultimate standard is a person, God, or is personal, I should say. He's not a person like we are, but He's personal. And He, being the standard of goodness and righteousness, who is our Creator, we're obligated to follow His nature, His purpose. If He doesn't exist, not only are there no rights to natural marriage, there's no right to same-sex marriage, there's no right to abortion, there's no right to life, there's no trans rights, there's no human rights, there's no Christian rights, there's no rights of any kind.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, obviously, Colin, when you're talking about talking with your friends at college, this could go quite deep. But if you just keep asking, why, why, why, why? Why is that a right? Why do you think that's a good thing? By what standard are you coming up with this with this claim? They're ultimately going to get back to either God or themselves, you know? So, just keep asking questions. Again, there's a lot more in the book 'Correct, Not Politically Correct.' You also want to pick up Allie Beth Stuckey's new book.

We had her on the show about a month ago, 'Toxic Empathy'. It might really feel good to say, you know, I'm for you, whatever relationship you want to be in. Love is love and all that, but it's really toxic empathy. You're not helping people when you approve of things that go against God's will and actually hurt them and others. You're not helping them. You're hurting them by approving them. You're enabling them to go down a road they ought not go down. So, check out the book 'Toxic Empathy'. Ladies and gentlemen, this December 13th, the next podcast will be with Dr. Jay Richards.

I don't want you to miss it because Jay has updated his fabulous book, 'Privileged Planet'. It came out 20 years ago. And it's about not only the fine-tuning of the universe, but an insight into the fine-tuning that, if you really think about it, lines up perfectly with Christianity. You don't want to miss that program, so check it out. I also want to thank you for all of your support over this year. We've reached out to so many people. We've been to so many campuses. And by the way, when we go to campuses, we don't charge students a dime.

A hundred percent of what you donate to CrossExamined.org goes to ministry. Zero percent to buildings. And one of the things, the main thing you donate to is for us to go to those college campuses for free to those students. We've been to several campuses this year. We've got several more coming up in the spring semester. We've got University of Nebraska, Ohio State, William and Mary, Mississippi State, several others, and they're all on our calendar at CrossExamined.org.

You're giving to those and you're also giving to our Kingdom AI Project. I mentioned that a couple of months ago that we are translating our best videos and articles into about 13 different languages, including Arabic, Russian, Ukrainian, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Dutch, Afrikaans and several others, because we want to reach about 3 billion people

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

potentially with the evidence for Christianity. And as I say, so far, we've translated over 3300 videos, over 1200 articles, and we've got a lot more to do, but we need your help to do that as well.

So, as you make your year-end donations, please consider giving a tax deductible donation to CrossExamined. Go to CrossExamined.org. Click on Donate. And again, 100% goes to ministry, 0% to buildings, because we are completely virtual. Thank you so much. Okay, second question comes from Seth. He says, I'm a Christian struggling to grasp the reliability of the moral argument for God's existence. The human flourishing argument is a really good counter, in my opinion, to this argument.

I know that it is false based off the cosmological argument in the Bible. But if the only way you can refute it is this counter with the moral argument, I'd say it defeats it. If you look at human flourishing more abstractly, it seems to be another valid source of our morality. If our morals come from a biological drive to flourish, then what can you say to that? Because it completely neglects objective good and evil.

If flourishing is our biological drive, then everything that would promote flourishing, like Sam Harris says, (He's an atheist who wrote the book, I think 'The Moral Sense', it's called) says would be objectively good, and everything that wouldn't promote it would be objectively bad.

You could say, why is flourishing objectively good? But that's precisely the point. It's only from a human point of view that flourishing is good. The argument is basically acknowledging and saying that our morals may not be objectively good. We are just programmed to follow our biological drive. And since our morals come from this drive to flourish, that is our concept of good and evil.

I would like to know if the moral argument alone can refute this argument, if it stops there. Thank you for your time, Seth. Okay, Seth, notice that the argument here that human flourishing is objectively good assumes a standard that human beings are objectively valuable, and you ought to treat them well.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Again, unless God exists, human beings are not objectively valuable. They're just creatures like everybody else with no ultimate purpose or meaning. It makes no difference whether you kill a human being or a bug, because we're all going to go to heat death at some point anyway. What's the point? What does it really matter? You say, well, a human being has rights. Only if God exists. If we're just an accidental collection of molecules floating through this random universe, we don't have any moral value.

We don't have any eternal value. We're just molecules in motion. So, why is that considered good? In fact, good doesn't even make sense from a moral perspective if we are just molecules in motion. Molecules don't have moral value. Biology is not a moral category. It's a physical category. You're confusing categories when you say morality and biology are the same thing. They're not the same.

They're not in the same category. In fact, in the book 'Stealing from God', we go through in a lot of detail as to why this can't work. Let me just mention a few of them. Can basically this evolution explain morality? And I say this in 'Stealing from God'. First, trying to explain morality by biology is a massive category mistake. A category mistake is when you treat something in one category as if it belongs in another category.

Like, for example, you're trying to say that biology and morality are in the same category. They're not. That's a category mistake. You can't explain an immaterial moral law by a material biological process. For example, justice is not made of molecules. Furthermore, moral laws are prescriptive that come from an authoritative personal agent. But a biological process is descriptive, and it has no authority to tell you what to do. I mean, how could a mutating genetic code have the moral authority to tell you how you ought to behave?

It doesn't. Now if Sam Harris, if he is saying, and he may be saying this, well, no, he tries to say that morality is objective, and human flourishing is the standard by which we determine whether or discover whether something is objective. But again, it can't be objectively good unless again, there's a standard outside of ourselves that we're obligated to obey.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And if God doesn't exist, that standard doesn't exist. So, they're not objective. But if you're saying that human flourishing is just biologically programmed into us, well, first of all, that wouldn't mean that there's an objective morality out there.

It would just mean that we think it's objectively good, but it's not really objectively good. Our biology is just telling us that it's objectively good, but it isn't really good. In other words, it's a trick of our biology, a moral sentiment. It's not really a moral obligation that we treat other people well.

Okay, well if it's not a moral obligation that we treat other people well, then it isn't wrong if you murder somebody else. But look, if biology gives us all of our moral sentiments, then biology also gives us all of our intellectual thoughts, including the thought that biology gives us all of our moral sentiment.

So, why should we believe that's true? I covered this, by the way, in a dialogue I had a number of years ago with the very brilliant young man Alex O'Connor. You can see that on the Unbelievable YouTube channel. And I think you can see it on Alex's YouTube channel as well, Cosmic Skeptic. Because he said that everything is biologically determined.

Our morals are biologically determined. And I said, well, if that's the case, the very statement you just made is biologically determined. So, why should we think it's true? In other words, it's a self-defeating position to say that biology gives us all our thoughts because then biology would give us that thought too.

And we can't test it to see if it's really true. If it's true, there's no way of knowing it's true. That's the problem. Also, our sex drive is biologically programmed as well. But why shouldn't we obey it whenever it comes up? If so, that would mean we, we should rape in order to propagate our genes, if survival is our goal, if human flourishing is our goal. And obviously, we know that's not true. We have a lot of predispositions, biological urges.

It doesn't mean we ought to follow them. We live in a fallen world. We're prone to be oversexed, and we're prone to overeat, and we're prone to get too much attention, and we're prone to go after things we don't need because we just want more. Sex, money, and power are

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

the three big, good things that we try and go after too much because we can't satiate our appetites for them. And the Bible talks a lot about this.

We need to crucify those desires when they get too strong because if we don't, we're going to hurt ourselves, and hurt others, and disobey God. So, there's a lot of reasons why this can't work. In fact, I say here in 'Stealing from God'. Biological processes can't make survival a moral right. There is no real good or purpose to evolution. Without God, survival is a subjective preference of the creature wanting to survive, but not an objective, moral good or right.

Biology describes what does survive, not what ought to survive. Why should humans survive as opposed to anything else? And which humans, we or the Nazis? You see? And as I said a minute ago too, if survival is the goal, should we rape to survive? In fact, if evolution gives us our morals, then since evolution is a process of change, then morals must change. Rape and murder may one day be considered good. So, if evolution is your guide, it's impossible for morals to be objective and unchanging.

This is why, to their credit, both Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris say I'm anti-Darwinian in my morality. I don't want survival of the fittest. I think that's wrong. The problem is for them in their atheistic, materialistic worldview, they don't have those resources. They don't have this objective moral standard beyond themselves that tells them that they ought not murder, rape, or steal. They don't want a society that murders, rapes, or steals. But without God, they can't justify why murder, rape, and theft are not really wrong.

So, to their credit, they realize they don't want an atheistic, materialistic, Darwinian morality. So, they have to steal a standard from God and import into their worldview to have civilization and to protect themselves. That's why, by the way, the book's called 'Stealing from God'. Let me deal with one other objection to this. A lot of people will say, well, you've got to cooperate in order to survive. And I write in 'Stealing from God', the claim that we wouldn't survive without cooperation is a pragmatic issue, not a moral issue.

And it's not even true. Many people survive and even prosper precisely because they don't cooperate with other people. Criminals offer prosper quite nicely, so do dictators. Atheist Joseph Stalin murdered millions more people than he cooperated with. He never got justice in

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

this life. He died comfortably in his bed at the age of 74, shaking his fist at God one last time. So, he didn't have to cooperate to succeed in his eyes. A lot of times you can get what you want without cooperating.

So, it doesn't even work. So, there's a lot more in the book 'Stealing from God' if you want to go further into that, Seth. But the moral argument is not defeated by human flourishing. Human flourishing imports or smuggles a moral standard into the atheistic system to try and have morality without God. But it ultimately it doesn't work. And as you pointed out by the way, the cosmological argument shows that at least some kind of theism is true.

The moral argument is just one other argument for theism. It's not the only argument for theism. You also have the design argument, the transcendental argument. Some point to the ontological argument. I don't often use that argument because I think it's controversial, but not even all theists agree with it. But you know, you've got several arguments for God. You've got, of course, the argument from the Resurrection. If Jesus really died and rose again, then Christianity appears to be true. And of course, if the first verse of the Bible is true, a resurrection like what Jesus provided is actually possible.

Because if God can create the universe out of nothing, He can certainly intervene in this universe to resurrect Jesus from the dead if He wanted to. And that's what appears actually did happen. And that's why we celebrate Christmas here in a couple of weeks. Because the creator of the universe added humanity to his deity, came to earth, lived the perfect life in our place, and then took our punishment upon Himself so we could not only be forgiven, but we could be given His righteousness.

That's the meaning of Christmas, that the creator of the universe took on human flesh to save human beings from the sins they've committed. Because Jesus is the ultimate standard of goodness, righteousness, and justice. And by definition, He can't be unjust. So, since we've all been unjust, He would have to punish us. But He doesn't want to punish us because He's infinitely loving as well. So, what does He do instead? He punishes Himself in our place. And you can be forgiven for any of the evil you've done by trusting in Him.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

All right, the final question is from River, who writes in and says, why does God create people that He knows will reject Him and therefore perish in Hell eternally? I want to clarify that. I'm not asking why doesn't God force people to choose Him and therefore go to heaven. I'm asking that since God knows before He creates someone whether they are going to Hell or not, if He is about to create someone, and He knows that they're going to reject Him and go to Hell eternally, why doesn't He just choose to not create them?

By doing so, He's not taking away our free will because the people He would create will still be people choosing Him. However, there would be nobody burning in Hell forever. Okay, first of all, good question, River. I like the little twist on it, but first of all, whenever you ask a question, why did God do X, Y or Z, and He hasn't told us why He's done X, Y, or Z, all we can do is speculate. We're doing some speculation here, but I think if we think about this, we can come to a reasonable cause as to why God, at least come up with a couple of reasons, why God didn't do as you say and not create people that He knew would go to Hell.

So, let me ask a question related to this. Is God morally obligated not to create someone who freely chooses not to accept His pardon? Let me say that again. Is God morally obligated not to create someone who freely chooses not to accept His pardon? Because that's what Christianity ultimately is. It's a pardon for the sins we've done. I don't think there's a moral standard out there that shows that God has to not create people He knew would freely decide to not want to be with Him in eternity.

You'd have to import a moral standard to say that's the case. And I know this may seem a little bit odd to say, but people who go to Hell get justice. It's not unjust when people go to Hell. By definition, God is just. He is the standard of justice. He can't be unjust. I know emotionally it may appear difficult. How could God punish people for all eternity? But by definition, since God is just, any punishment He metes out is precisely just.

Nobody's going to get what they don't deserve. Everyone's going to get exactly what they deserve and not an ounce more or an ounce less because God is the standard of justice. I mean, the question assumes that eternal justice is somehow unjust. But why think that if God is infinitely just, He can be unjust? He can't be unjust. Whatever Hell is, and there is a lot of metaphors to explain Hell. You know, it's outer darkness, but it's also burning fire, right?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

It's weeping and gnashing of teeth. It's outer darkness, a bottomless pit. There's all sorts of metaphors used to describe Hell. They're probably not literal because it would be difficult to have, say, burning and darkness at the same time. But that doesn't mean that they're not terrible. It's still a terrible place even if the literal, or I should say the metaphorical doesn't line up with the literal exactly.

Because that's what a metaphor is. It's trying to say it's like something. It shouldn't give us any comfort, in other words, to say, oh, I'm glad the burning's not literal. Hell is separation from God, according to Paul. I think it's in 2 Thessalonians he talks about this. We're separated from God. We're separating from the ultimate source of justice, goodness, and righteousness by our own choice. And there are different levels of punishment as God talks about, Jesus talks about.

I think it's Luke 12. People who know more will be beaten with more blows. People who know less will be beaten with fewer blows. This is where the passage to whom much is given, much will be required, comes from, that standard. It would be unjust of God to punish somebody who knew more. Or let me put it another way, it would be unjust of God to punish someone who knew less, had less moral culpability than someone who had more moral culpability. What I'm pointing out here again is that God is going to be just in whatever punishment He metes out.

So, no one is going to be in the afterlife going, God, if I only knew God, I got a raw deal. This is unjust. In fact, even in the story, it doesn't appear to be a parable because there's names in it. But in Luke 16, the rich man and Lazarus. Notice, the rich man in Hades is not complaining by saying, hey, I shouldn't be here. This is a raw deal. He's saying, just send Lazarus down here to put some water on my tongue because I'm in agony here in this fire.

In other words, he seems to be saying, just relieve my suffering. But it's not like I shouldn't be here. And by the way, notice he's still treating Lazarus like a servant. He still has the anti-God, the anti-Jesus state of mind. He doesn't say, let me out. What he says is, warn my loved ones about this place. And of course, Jesus says, look. They've got Moses and the prophets. If they don't believe them, they're not even going to believe if someone rises from the dead. How many people do you know out there that if a miracle appeared before them, they still wouldn't believe?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

In fact, if you look through the Bible, miracles don't always have the intended effect that we think they would have. The Israelites, they see miracle after miracle. And then Moses spends a few extra nights up on Mount Sinai, which, by the way, when you're hearing this, I'm probably on the real Mount Sinai. We're recording this at the end of November. But the first two weeks of December, we're on a trip to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. We think the real Mount Sinai is Jabal al-Lawz. Anyway, keep an eye on our YouTube channel.

We'll be sending some video back. But I digress. The point here is, is that Moses just spends a few extra nights on Mount Sinai and suddenly they're worshiping the golden calf. You say, well, yeah, you forgot about all the miracles God did? Miracles don't always have the intended effect that we think they would. We're fickle. We lose faith quickly. We want to do our own thing. So, God provides enough evidence so that we know He exists.

But He also leaves enough ambiguity so people can go the way they want to go. They can walk away. They can walk away freely. So, we also need to remember when God creates people or allows people to be created, parents are the instrumental cause through which God creates, that unbelievers still get God's will done on earth. God can bring good from evil.

When unbelievers or even believers do evil, God can bring good from it. In fact, He promises to do so. We've talked about the example from the Old Testament, Joseph. Joseph is sold into slavery by his brothers. And then of course, later on, he saves his brothers from a famine. And what does he say to them? What you meant for evil, God meant for good, the saving of many lives.

In other words, evil can ripple forward to bring forth good later. God promises to do that. In fact, in Romans 8, he says, now we know that all things work together for good. Doesn't say all things are good, says all things work together for good to those that love God and are called according to His purpose.

And he goes on to say, this happens so you can be conformed to the image of His Son. When you go through difficulty and you're a Christian, you're being conformed to the image of Jesus if you have the right attitude about it. That's the purpose or one purpose God can bring from evil.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

If you're not a Christian, hopefully the suffering can bring you to Christ and then later grow you in Christ. So, when God allows unbelievers to be born, He's creating a universe where there are wheats and tares, and even some of the evil that is done both by Christians and non-Christians can help refine people to be more like Jesus.

Even Richard Dawkins, who writes a book, 'The God Delusion', right? He writes a book, 'The God Delusion'. A Christian picks it up and reads it and goes, oh, I've got to get answers to these arguments. Then he starts doing research. He winds up getting closer to God by reading a book written by an atheist because he's motivated by what the atheist has said to investigate God more clearly and more intently. Here's an example where an atheist is actually doing the will of God inadvertently. There's a ripple effect here in other words. This would be a different universe without unbelievers.

It would be. You take one unbeliever out, even one believer out, it's a different universe. We're all interconnected through the ripple effect. So, to say that why doesn't God just not create all these unbelievers He knew would go to Hell? God might not get His will done here on Earth if He did that by not only what unbelievers do, but how it ripples forward to affect believers through their actions. Again, we're doing some speculation here because God doesn't explain all this, but we can see how this ripple effect can work. Also, we know that some virtues can only be achieved through pain and suffering.

Paul talks about this in 2 Corinthians 4, where he says, our light and momentary afflictions are achieving for us a greater weight of glory that far outweighs them all. So, we fix our eyes not on what is seen, for what is seen is temporary. We fix our eyes on what is unseen, for what is unseen is eternal. In other words, you go through difficulty here. When you do that, you're enhancing your capacity to enjoy God, not only now, but in eternity. Because going through pain and suffering grows you. As I said before, just like in marriage. What if God created marriage more for your holiness than your happiness?

What if going through pain and suffering makes you more like Jesus? In fact, the Scriptures say that Jesus learned obedience through suffering. What? The God man who didn't have a fallen human nature. He had a human nature, but it wasn't fallen. He didn't have a sin nature. He learned obedience through suffering. What does that mean for us? Do you think we can learn

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

obedience through suffering? If Jesus had to learn it, we certainly have to learn it. So, there may be several reasons, River, why God has created unbelievers knowing that they would ultimately wind up in Hell.

God can get His will done even through unbelievers. And of course, through believers. God can draw a straight line with a crooked stick, in other words. And people that get justice in the afterlife are getting exactly that, justice. It's not unjust to be in Hell. You're getting exactly what you deserve, and God is going to met out the appropriate level of punishment for your particular case, whatever particular case we're talking about. Of course we don't want you to go there, River. I'm just saying that people who do go there, justice is a good thing.

And there's only two things you can get in the afterlife. You can either get grace or you can get justice. And I don't want justice, and neither should you. Nobody listening to my voice should want justice in the afterlife. Because if you got justice for everything you've said and done that was unjust, you wouldn't like it. I wouldn't like it. Look, either you're going to pay, or Jesus is going to pay. Who do you want to pay? Well, it's an appropriate way to end the program. You want Jesus to pay. That's why He came to Earth, to add humanity to His deity.

So, He is the perfect sacrifice, the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world could do so. And you could be free from the just punishment that you deserve. And you can not only be forgiven, you can be given His righteousness, and then join the group of believers who are here on a mission to stack eternity with as many people as possible and to make them more like Jesus in the process. What could be more impactful than eternity, ladies and gentlemen?

You think you're an unbeliever and you think you have a cause? Well, how about a cause for eternity? You're not only affecting time, but you're affecting eternity. People, human beings that you love, and that God loves, you're helping build an eternal kingdom. What could be more important than that? That's why Jesus came, and suffered, and died so we could be at peace with God and His infinitely just standard, and we could be given the kingdom.

We're heirs to the throne by trusting in Jesus. You can't earn it. You can only receive it. You can't achieve it. You can only receive it. You don't achieve your identity. You receive your identity. That's why Jesus had to come. So, if you've never accepted that, why not do it now?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Why not repent of your sins and accept grace? Accept forgiveness, rather than accepting judgment that you deserve for all the unjust things you've done. All right, friends, I'll see you here, Lord willing, next week. God bless.

CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG

